





## INTERNATIONAL HANDBOOKS TO THE NEW TESTAMENT

Edited by ORELLO CONE, D.D.

4 vols. Octavo. Each, net, \$2.00. By mail, \$2.15

- I. **The Synoptic Gospels**, etc. By GEORGE L. CARY, L.H.D.
- II. **The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Thesalonians**, etc. By JAMES DRUMMOND, M.A., LL.D., Litt.D.
- III. **Hebrews, Colossians, Ephesians**, etc. By ORELLO CONE, D.D.
- IV. **The Johannine Literature and The Acts of the Apostles**, etc. By HENRY P. FORBES, D.D.

INTERNATIONAL HANDBOOKS  
TO THE  
NEW TESTAMENT

By ORELLO CONE, D.D. Editor, GEORGE L. CARY, L.H.D.  
JAMES DRUMMOND, LL.D., AND HENRY P. FORBES, D.D.





THE  
JOHANNINE LITERATURE  
AND  
THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

BY  
HENRY PRENTISS FORBES, A.M., D.D.

Professor of Biblical Literature in the Canton Theological School

---

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS  
NEW YORK AND LONDON  
The Knickerbocker Press  
1907

COPYRIGHT, 1907  
BY  
HENRY PRENTISS FORBES

The Knickerbocker Press, New York

## GENERAL PREFACE TO THE SERIES.

THESE Handbooks constitute an exegetical series covering the entire New Testament and constructed on a plan which admits of greater freedom of treatment than is usual in commentaries proper. The space generally devoted in commentaries to a minute examination of the grammatical construction of passages of minor importance is occupied with the discussion of those of a special interest from a doctrinal and practical point of view. Questions of the authorship and date of the several books are treated in carefully-prepared Introductions, and numerous Dissertations are inserted elucidating matters of graver moment.

The books of the New Testament are treated as a literature which in order to be understood must be explained, like all other ancient literatures, in accordance with the accepted principles of the grammatical and historical interpretation. The aim of the writers has been to ascertain and clearly set forth the meaning of the authors of these books by the application of this method in freedom from dogmatic prepossessions.

The purpose has been constantly kept in view to furnish a series of Handbooks to the New Testament which should meet the wants of the general reader, and at the same time present the results of the latest scholarship and of the most thorough critical investigation.

Accordingly, more prominence has been given to the statement of the results of the critical processes than to the presentation of the details of these processes by means of extended discussions of questions of Greek grammar, philology, and exegesis. Hence, while the advanced student will find much to interest him in these volumes, it is believed that ministers who have not the time to occupy themselves with the refinements of minute hermeneutics, superintendents and teachers of Sunday-schools, and Bible-students in general will find them suited to their needs. The text used is that of the Revised Version, although for the purpose of saving space the text has not been printed, and the passages explained have been indicated in part by references only and in part by references together with a few initial words.

THE EDITOR.

# CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.	
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	I
COMMENTARY . . . . .	13
THE REVELATION OF JOHN.	
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	87
COMMENTARY . . . . .	99
THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.	
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	151
COMMENTARY . . . . .	177
THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN.	
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	341
COMMENTARY . . . . .	343
THE SECOND EPISTLE OF JOHN.	
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	363
COMMENTARY . . . . .	365
THE THIRD EPISTLE OF JOHN.	
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	364
COMMENTARY . . . . .	367
INDEX TO THE SERIES . . . . .	369



# THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

---

## INTRODUCTION.

### I.—CONTENTS AND STRUCTURE.

**A**CTS is the story: (*a*) chronologically, of the fortunes of the Christian movement from the Ascension to the second year of Paul's Roman imprisonment, embracing therefore some thirty years; (*b*) biographically, of the deeds of Peter and Paul, with incidental mention of other apostolic personages such as James, John, Philip, Barnabas; (*c*) geographically, of the extension of Christianity from Jerusalem along the eastern, then the northern, shore of the Mediterranean as far as Rome on the west; (*d*) ethnographically, of the gradual passage of the new religion from a purely Jewish and Palestinian constituency to localities and races of the Greek and Roman world.

Within these wide ranges the narrative proceeds with a peculiar distribution of material and with singular absences—for to designate them omissions were here to render a prejudgment at once unscientific and in disparagement of the author—; unimportant detail is inserted and momentous events are absent; the most of the space is occupied with the narratives concerning Peter and Paul, but even here there is curious limitation, for only the earlier part of Peter's activity is delineated and of Paul's experiences as summarised in 2 Cor. xi. the most receive no notice, while the book leaves



the apostle in the suspense of imprisonment; the apostles appear in the list of ch. i., but, save Peter and James and the vague form of John, reappear no more; there is no history of the churches in Judea; it is only the flash-light of Paul's conversion which reveals Christians at Damascus, and the south shore of the Mediterranean is dark; of the inner history, the beginnings of a cultus, the structure of the organisations, the race antipathies, the clash of opinions, the divisive contentions, only a few traces appear. These phenomena of plethora and leanness, of absence and unequal distribution, suggest the chief problems, *the* problem, of Acts: Where, when, how, why, from whom did a book of such singular features arise?

The structure or arrangement was apparently determined by no one definite principle. As the third Gospel shows a grouping according to the geographical order; Galilee, Samaria, Jerusalem, the Acts (see i. 8) fixes clearly its termini as Jerusalem and Rome. From this point of view a proper division might well be: (*a*) The Gospel in Jerusalem, i.-vii.; (*b*) The Gospel in the intermediate region of Samaria and Antioch, viii.-xii.; (*c*) The Gospel in the Gentile world, Asia Minor, Greece, Italy, xiii.-xxviii. This is however influenced by superior considerations of a biographical nature, which allow or suggest a division according to the history of the two great personalities: (*a*) Peter the Founder, i.-xii.; (*b*) Paul the Missionary, xiii.-xxviii. But these have no clear line of demarcation; the material and the purpose alike forbade any rigid order.

## 2.—AUTHORSHIP AND TIME.

Its relationship to the third Gospel furnishes a valuable starting-point for the investigation of many problems of Acts.

The common tradition, the dedication to the same person (Luke i. 3; Acts i. 1), the similarity of style and manner of

treatment, the resemblance in religious standpoint, sufficiently establish identity of authorship.

Since the Gospel is the earlier (Acts i. 1), and the difference which appears in the two narratives of the Ascension (concerning which see note following Acts i. 11) has its most natural explanation in the supposition that an interval of some years separates the two, the composition of Acts must have taken place far toward the end of the first century or may well be regarded as one of the earliest products of the second.

For the author of Luke according to his own testimony wrote when the first generation had gone and many persons of the second had attempted to compose Gospel narratives (Luke i. 1-3), with which he must have been familiar; the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 lay behind him and in no near distance (Luke xix. 42-44, xxi. 20-24); his use of Mark is proof of a comparatively late composition. With this evidence the phenomena of Acts agree. The author is so far removed from some events and features that he misunderstands them: legend has crept in; the developed ecclesiasticism (Acts xi. 30; xiv. 23; government by apostles, xv.; imposition of hands, vi. 6; viii. 17) is that of the Pastorals; the controversies of the earlier years are softened by distance; the past is idealised. If Josephus is one of the author's sources—and this is asserted for v. 36, 37, by the conservative Wendt (*Apostelgeschichte*, 37),—the composition must have been subsequent to 94 A.D.; but this is a confessedly uncertain point. The chief reasons adduced by Harnack (*Chronologie*, 248-50) for a date earlier than 95 A.D. are: the absence of any use of a collection of Pauline epistles and the representation of the Roman government as indifferent and the populace as not yet antipathetic; but the non-use of the Pauline literature may be due to the author's deliberate choice or to his isolation from the few centres where they circulated at this time; and the presence of hostility and persecution from

Rome and the rabble might easily induce the author to bring into stronger contrast the quiet and even the favour of the earlier period of which he wrote.

The abrupt conclusion of the work led naturally to the inference, current since Jerome, that it was written at the conclusion of Paul's two years of imprisonment at Rome, and while he was still awaiting trial. The considerations already mentioned render this date impossible; the reasons for the unexpected close spring from the design of the work or from its sources.

Tradition since the last quarter of the second century (Muratorian Canon, Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 14, 15) names Luke as the author. The prologue (Luke i. 1-4) where the author puts himself into the ranks of the next generation after the apostles, the traces of want of immediate acquaintance with Paul save in the sources employed, the absence of exact knowledge of early conditions as revealed in the genuine Pauline literature, the late date of the composition, all render the Lucan authorship very improbable. Where evidence of a positive nature is wanting, dogmatism is offensive; but some weight may safely be allowed to tradition; a very reasonable supposition is that Luke was the author of the chief source used, the "we-sections"; and that thence the completed work was attributed to him, just as our first Gospel obtained its name and tradition of authorship from its large use of the Logia of Matthew.

The Acts came more slowly into use than the Gospel; there may be traces of it in the Ignatian letters, the pages of Justin first reveal a real familiarity with its contents.

### 3.—SOURCES.

Since the author is thus some decades away from the latest events of his record and parted by a half century at least from the earliest, the question of source is of great importance, since it involves both the problem as to the aim of the

work and that concerning its historical value. For the apparent tendencies may have their explanation in the material used; and the worth of the narrative is in large measure dependent upon the character of the sources. To this problem the Tübingen school gave little heed; *their* tendency was to regard all characteristic features as due to the arbitrariness and inventive facility of the author. In the succeeding decades the opposite propensity has been increasingly manifest; B. Weiss, Sorof, Feine, Spitta, Hilgenfeld, are prominent among the many who have subjected Acts to microscopic examination, and found explicit traces of the use of literary material.

The proof of the existence of such sources is fairly established; the attempts to reconstruct them from our text must ever result in partial failure; the author has here, as in Luke, partially transformed the substance; he is no mere redactor.

The prologue to Luke (i. 1-4) declares the existence of written attempts to set forth the "matters which have been fulfilled among us," and nowhere intimates that they were confined to the history of Jesus. That Mark and the Logia of Matthew were used as chief sources is well-nigh universally recognised; and since the events of the earlier chapters of Acts are nearly synchronous with those of the later chapters of Luke, it is probable that the author would as gladly avail himself of any written records of a period so far removed from his own.

The two-fold conception of the glossolaly in ii. 1-13, the divergent features of the representation as to the community of goods in iv. 31-v. 11, the manifest interweaving of two themes in the speech of Stephen in vii. 2-53; the incongruities in the narrative concerning Cornelius, x. 1-xi. 18, the composite structure of the account of the conference at Jerusalem, xv. 1-33,—for all of which see the notes appended to the exegesis of these several sections,—are only a few among

the many convincing proofs that the author was using written material. This is confirmed by a study of the sections in which the first person plural appears, the so-called "we-sections" (xvi. 10-17; xx. 5-15; xxi. 1-18; xxvii. 1-xxviii. 16). They are distinguished by no peculiarities of vocabulary, but the conciseness of expression, the circumstantiality, the freshness of the detail, indicate the eye-witness; and since among these are passages where the description is vague, schematic, and unhistorical, betraying like the earlier chapters an incomplete acquaintance with the conditions of the apostolic age and especially with the personal history of Paul, the conclusion is irresistible that the later author is here incorporating a source much earlier and of great historical value. It is probable that our five sections are but a small portion of the original work, and there is at least plausibility in the conclusion of Wendt that many passages in Acts which do not have its characteristic first person plural may be more transformed excerpts from it. That Luke was its author was above affirmed as probable: it perished as a separate work, like the *Logia*, because of its partial incorporation into a more useful production.

By this use of sources the historical value of the volume was increased. The want of entire unity which more recent research has clearly set forth is proof that the written material exercised a powerful influence upon the substance and structure of the Book of Acts in its present form: and we may well ask whether there may not here be found some partial explanation of the difference of opinion concerning its purpose or "tendency."

#### 4.—PURPOSE.

Though dedicated, like Luke (i. 1-4), to Theophilus, the object of Acts is broader than the instruction of a single person. The unequal distribution of its matter, its strange omissions, its unexpected selections, afforded a natural basis

for the inference that the author had some purpose other than the general one of conveying information. But the search for a special aim has been singularly unfruitful. The Tübingen school, keen-scented for "tendency," found in its deviations from the Pauline epistles, even its downright contradictions to them, its parallels of word and act in the histories of Peter and Paul, and in its vague doctrine, proof that it was the product of an attempt to conciliate hostile Jewish-Christian and Pauline factions. Much that this school asserted was true, but its hypothesis of conciliation has been abandoned because of the presence of such anti-Jewish features in Acts, the retention or invention of material which would rather create than allay factional dissatisfaction, and especially because so much of the contents stands in no discoverable relation to the hypothesis. A more recent statement of the aim, which still makes prominent doctrinal or race considerations, is that of Schmiedel (*Encyclopædia Biblica*, article "Acts"), who asserts that the author's "aim is to justify the Gentile Christianity of himself and his time, already on the way to Catholicism." If the word "Gentile" be omitted, the statement may stand, since a history of the apostolic time by a writer himself a Christian would naturally be apologetic in tone; but if Schmiedel means, as is apparently the case, that the author intended by a shrewd manipulation of the material to justify Gentile Christianity in the eyes of Jewish Christians, he only restates in substance the position of the Tübingen school. For surely Gentile Christianity stood in no need of self-justification, the verdict of fact at the end of the century was sufficient; the command of Jesus (i. 8) contains no injunction to preach to Gentiles; Peter, Philip, and the founders of the church at Antioch do not offer the Gospel to Gentiles because the Jews reject it but because the Holy Spirit moves them to it; Paul often proceeds immediately to Gentile missionary endeavour (xiii. 6; xiv. 7; xvii. 10, 17). One must also regard as unfounded

the view that the book is "an apology for the Christian religion" written for non-Christians after the manner of Quadratus, Aristides, or Justin. Of its composition for Christian readers every chapter bears testimony; if indeed the narrative often presents the Roman government as unbiassed or favourable (xvi. 20; xvii. 6-9; xix. 35-41; xxiv. 5, 22-26; xxv. 18-27), this was simply the situation of these early days as depicted in the author's sources; if the officials are sometimes friendly, they are also hostile. How fatal to the purpose of depicting Christianity as appealing favourably to Roman officials of the time of Domitian or Trajan are the narratives of Paul's missionary career (xiii.-xxi) which represent him in his whole course, at Lystra, Iconium, Philippi, Thessalonica, Ephesus, Jerusalem, as the constant and efficient even if the involuntary cause of brawl, uproar, tumult! How useless as a means of securing heathen favour in the changed conditions of the end of the century would be the presented attitude of Festus or Felix in the days of Nero! Above all, how worse than useless would be the attempt to make the relations of Paul and the Roman officials as depicted in Acts of any apologetic value to a world which knew that its supreme official, the Emperor, had pronounced the sentence of death against this very man!

If the author wrote to the Roman world for purposes of apology, the only means by which he can be exonerated from something worse than ineptitude is by the hypothesis that he knew or believed that Paul was acquitted by Nero; in which case his book is Hamlet with Hamlet omitted.

Doubtless the author would desire to say nothing unfavourable of the Roman power; but a sufficient explanation of this favourable presentation is found in the author's picture of the golden apostolic age; he puts the indifferent or friendly power of those happier days into sharp but unspoken contrast with the Rome, drunken with the blood of martyrs, whose gory hand was laid upon the Church of his own time.

Since therefore much that was claimed as proof of tendency or purpose turns out to be more or less incidental feature,—Schmiedel's discovery of *three* tendencies is concession in this direction—; since in composite structures the material employed leaves traces, often distinct, which it were unjust to attribute to the redactor's "tendency,"—there remains the wholesome appeal to the two most manifest characteristics of the book: its fervent religiosity and its interest in persons; it is at once a sermon and a series of biographies; one can with difficulty improve upon the statement of Jülicher that the purpose of the author is to write "the history of the power of God in the apostles," if only one clearly realise that it is history in the ancient, Oriental, religious, and not in the modern, Occidental, critical sense. The author will complement his "former treatise," Luke, which may well be called "the story of the Founder of the kingdom," with a "story of the apostles who extended the kingdom." This task he accomplishes in a manner accordant with the spirit of his age and the special conditions of Christianity in the post-apostolic generation.

#### 5.—HISTORICITY.

The credibility of Acts may be estimated firstly by the sources used, secondly by the author's historical or homiletic method. The sources were largely written as we have seen; oral tradition had become too remote and uncertain. But the "sources behind the sources" were oral, and in the general processes of oral tradition and the freedom of literary treatment we find little warrant for a guarantee of historicity in the modern critical signification of the term. The most distinguishing trait is here plasticity, disregard for exactitude. Even Ramsay, who begins his famous work on *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen* with the assertion that the author of Acts is a trustworthy historian of the first rank (pp. 1-10), finds himself compelled at the close of the



book to accuse his model historian of including in chapters i.-v. many unhistorical and "second-rate" incidents, and to excuse him by saying: "The Oriental mind has little or nothing of the proper historical tone.

It substitutes the moral apologue for history in the strict sense of the term, craving for the former and possessing little regard for the latter. It acts with great rapidity, transforming the memory of the past within the lapse of a few years" (p. 369).

A treatment ethical in its aim, imaginative in its method, garbing the earlier fact in ever-changing local costume amid the shifting scenery of the decades, soon conceals the bare reality in a Joseph's coat which cannot be put off.

Of equal importance is the absence of the sense of development, that conception of evolution which dominates modern history. All that belonged to an author's own time, itself the cumulated and complex result of genetic processes, was then easily, perhaps of necessity, carried back to the initial stages; men full-grown, armed, battle-instructed, spring from the soil; under the treatment of the chronicler the time of David and Solomon is fitted out with the excellencies of the post-exilic cultus; the Talmudic Adam has the wisdom of the Rabbis; the Moses of Philo outshines Plato in philosophy.

As a result the treatment is uncertain; now the author is the historian giving us the accredited fact; now the homilete, pointing the moral by adorning the tale; now the man of faith, lifting the earth-born fact into the upper air of miracle. It is therefore unscientific to judge the author and his work by modern historical canons continent-wide from the whole genius of Oriental religious literature; useless to defend the precise historicity of every presented narrative, as Zöckler still inclines to do; unjust above all to regard the work as the cunning device of a bloodless contriver, as was the inclination of the Tübingen criticism. Much of that criticism, however, as *historical* criticism was valid and will endure.

Peter and Paul *are* more alike in the picture drawn than in the historical reality; the narrative of the council (chap. xv.) *does* omit some unpleasant features; there *is* a remarkable parallelism in the histories of Peter and Paul; the Paul of Acts *is not* the real Paul of the genuine epistles; the narratives *do* contain legendary elements; the picture of the apostolic age is incomplete and needs correcting and supplementing from other sources.

The contents are of all grades of historical value from the first hand and authentic sketches of the diary to the legendary narratives about an Ananias or a shadow that had healing power. In the case of the so-called miracles it is here as elsewhere generally impossible to dissect out the original fact; the narratives are in their present form the expression of the trusting faith that God was not far away but among them "to will and to do of his good purpose." But far as it is from the ideal of historical accuracy, its value is not in the religious or moral spheres alone; it supplements our other sources with many valuable facts especially as concerns the life of Paul; while the spirit of the author's later time breathes through his periods and the interests of his own age appear, his work does present to us, in its main outlines, a fairly authentic and exceedingly precious account of the years and deeds and persons wherein and whereby the Palestinian message of good tidings became a Gospel for and in the whole world of men.

The text has suffered many changes, and is uncertain in detail; the Western varies widely from the Eastern. Bornemann, Hilgenfeld, and Blass have endeavoured to establish the superiority of the readings in the bi-lingual codex D.; but the text of the earlier codices, which is followed in the Greek Testament of Westcott and Hort and in the Revised Version, is surely entitled to general preference.



# THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

---

## COMMENTARY.

### I. 1-11. The ascension of Jesus.

*The former treatise* (v. 1): our Third Gospel. *Theophilus* (v. 1): a name found only here and Lk. i. 3; either a friend of the writer, or an ideal reader; since the word means "friend of God."

*Given commandment* (v. 2) refers to Lk. xxiv. 48, 49. The words *through the Holy Ghost* modify the verb *chosen*; the author will show that the apostles were divinely selected: so Judas by the heaven-directed lot, i. 23-26.

*Apostles* (v. 2): here and usually in Acts the word denotes "the twelve." In xiv. 4, 14, taken probably from some source, we have the broader Pauline use. *Proofs* (v. 3), refers to the remainder of this sentence and Lk. xxiv. 39-43. *Appearing*: the Greek verb implies the visionary character of the manifestation.

*Forty days*: the phrase in Biblical usage denotes an extended indefinite period of time; in 4 Ezra xiv., Ezra was forty days dictating the law. *The things concerning the kingdom of God* denote especially the new Messianic interpretation of Old Testament passages; the Gnostics held the post-resurrection utterances to be the mysteries of the æons, the Catholics consider them instructions concerning the Church, its sacraments, its orders.

On the words *not to depart* (v. 4), see Lk. xxiv. 49. *The*

*promise of the Father* is not in the Gospels (save possibly in Lk. xxiv. 49) since they contain no prediction of a Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit.

*Restore the kingdom to Israel* (v. 6): since the word *restore* implies loss we have here the traditional idea of the renewed political supremacy of the Messianic time.

In vv. 7, 8, we have the clear expression of the post-apostolic time of the writer: ignorance and uncertainty as to the Parousia, the possession of the Spirit, and the duty of bearing witness to Jesus before the whole Roman world. The coming of the Spirit is the first step in the restoration. The delineation of witness-bearing in ever-widening circles, until Paul in chap. xxviii. reaches Rome, an "uttermost part of the earth" of missionary activity at the writer's time, is the most general purpose of the book.

*A cloud received him* (v. 9): the clouds are the garments of spiritual beings; they both reveal and conceal them. Dan. vii. 13; Mk. ix. 7.

In vv. 10, 11, we have a rebuke from heaven of idle expectation of an immediate Parousia, but a divine affirmation of its certainty and its concrete visibility; the post-apostolic faith and expectation.

Lk. xxiv. 49-52 represents the ascension as occurring on the day of the resurrection, while Acts i. 3 allows an interval of forty days. The difference is clear; though some, as Zöckler, would avoid a contradiction by expunging from Lk. xxiv. 51 the somewhat poorly attested clause "and was carried up into heaven," and thus regard Lk. xxiv. 36-51 as the narration of an appearing of Jesus, not of the ascension. But the formal nature of that passage, the command to tarry in the city, the solemn blessing, the parting, the explication of the Old Testament, the names of localities, and other features similar to Acts i. 6-12, indicate that we have here two divergent forms of the same tradition.

In Cod. D. and Acts of Pilate, Jesus first enters a cloud, then disappears.

It may be remarked: (1) that the ascension is based upon the old

geocentric idea, according to which above the stable flat earth are superimposed near heavens where the same physical conditions prevail; (2) that in the earliest tradition of the post-crucifixion life of Jesus *the* ascension as a single and final event was not included; and that as long as, or wherever, the resurrection is conceived as spiritual rather than as a resumption of the gross material body and its functions the ascension had no distinct importance, inasmuch as the resurrection itself was entrance into life and glory; *e. g.*, Paul himself (1 Cor. xv.) represents the appearances of the risen Christ as extending over months or years and independent of the usual spatial limitations; (3) that, when the resurrection is conceived as reanimation or the resumption of the former body with its gross functions such as eating or digesting, some important change is necessary before Christ can become co-regent at the right hand of God and a visible ascension assumes psycho-somatic importance; (4) that thus when the later tradition became more materialistic the ascension became prominent and its tradition is (as Meyer concedes) a secondary one, since it is absent from the Pauline writings and three of our four Gospels; (5) that there is a manifest inclination to increase the length of time between the resurrection and the ascension. If in Lk. xxiv. and Barnabas xv. 9 both events occur on the same day, in Acts i. 3 they are separated by an interval of forty days; the Valentinians, Ophites, and Ascension of Isaiah make the interval eighteen months, and Pistis Sophia extends it to eleven years.

#### The earliest life of the apostles in Jerusalem, i. 12-14

*Olivet* (v. 12): a mountain east of Jerusalem, separated by the valley of the stream Kidron; the *sabbath-day's journey* is five or six thousand feet: the distance is given that the readers may know more precisely the locality of the ascension. The *upper chamber* (v. 13) may be a compartment of the temple, on account of Lk. xxiv. 53 and Acts ii. 46 (so Holzmann, *Hand Com.*, 3, 1901), or more probably a private room, as the hierarchy would not have allowed the followers of Jesus rooms in the temple. The list of the eleven is the same as in Lk. vi. 14 *f.*, save slight changes in the order. *Mary* is made prominent, as in Lk. i.—the beginnings of the movement toward Mariolatry—; the *brethren* are Jesus'

brothers; without support are the Protestant assertions that they are half-brothers, or the Catholic that they are cousins.

**Choice of a successor to Judas Iscariot, i. 15-26.**

Before the Spirit descends the apostolic circle must be made complete, which is here accomplished by the whole body of believers, *brethren*, the number of whom, *about one hundred and twenty*, v. 15, is probably ideal and symbolical ( $12 \times 10$ , or  $3 \times 40$ ), since vv. 13, 14, naturally refer to a smaller number. In vv. 16, 17, the transgression of Judas, itself a reflection upon the insight of Jesus and the integrity of his followers, is presented as the predicted fulfilment of a divine decree. The citation is in v. 20.

The Revisers have placed vv. 18, 19, in parenthesis; Weiss and others regard them as interpolated, since (a) v. 20 follows v. 17; (b) the expression *now this man* sounds formal, (c) the words *in their tongue* have no pertinency in the Aramaic discourse of Peter. But the quotation of v. 20 has only partial pertinency if these are omitted.

*Akeldama* (v. 20) or *Aceldamach*.—In Aramaic either *field of death* or *field of blood*, the former the earlier tradition. The whole verse is out of place as a word of Peter; he spoke in Aramaic; there was no time for the popular change of name to be made; therefore the verse is for distant and later Greek readers.

The quotation of v. 20 is combined from the Greek version of Ps. lxi. 25 and cix. 8. Both Psalms are from the Persian period (so Cheyne); and refer to Jewish opponents of the fifth or fourth centuries B.C.

The Fate of Judas.—The early Church had no definite information concerning the end of the treacherous disciple. Mark and John are silent. Matthew (xxvii. 5-8) and Acts (i. 18-20) give divergent traditions, and Papias, soon after, gives a third, stating that the body of Judas, enormously swollen, was crushed by a chariot against a wall. Dark mystery conceals his fate; poetic justice demanded what history may have actually furnished, a tragedy.

In *vv.* 21, 22, the earliest requisite of apostleship: discipleship of Jesus from the Jordan baptism until the ascension, is laid down. The words *with us*, *v.* 22, refer to the eleven.

*Joseph* (*v.* 23) is not elsewhere mentioned in the New Testament. Papias knew a tradition of his drinking poison without harm, Eusebius makes him one of the Seventy of Lk. x. 1. Matthias disappears as suddenly as he appears.

*That he might go to his own place* (*v.* 25.)—Theophylact explained the passage as referring to the apostle to be chosen who will *go to his own place*: *i. e.*, the apostleship, on the ground that a sentence of Judas would not be expressed in a prayer. But since the prayer is freely written—a whole congregation could not have formulated such a petition—the words may more naturally be referred to Judas, whose own place is the underworld or its place of torment: Gehenna. In view of the diversity of opinion among Jews and early Christians concerning the duration and finality of Gehenna conditions, this is, as even Alford confesses, “no absolute sentence.”

*They gave lots* (*v.* 26): the election was thus of combined human and divine choice; the assembly selected two, of these God elected one. The lot was a favourite means of ascertaining Jehovah's will: Lev. xvi. 8.

The historicity of the election is not to be denied; but its features are of post-apostolic tinge, and its historical place is *after* the Pentecost re-heartening. Its place in Acts is programmatic; the author will represent the believers as already reorganised and prepared for the Pentecostal missionary activity.

### The giving of the Spirit, ii. 1-13.

The word *Pentecost* (ii. 1), became the designated name of the Jewish “feast of weeks,” held fifty days after the second of the Passover feast, and marked especially by the formal offering of the first loaves made from the new wheat crop.

The *wind* (*v.* 2) is in Scripture a symbol of God's presence.



The *house* is probably one of the halls of the temple, where the brethren had gathered for morning prayer, see v. 15; these halls were sometimes called "houses" (so Josephus): and the transactions demand more space than a private house could afford. The author may have desired to point out that not the whole Jewish temple (*ἱερόν*), but the portion frequented by Christians (*οἶκος*) was filled by the Spirit.

*Tongues parting asunder* (v. 3): these are presented as fiery flashes forked or broken, one of which rested gleaming and scintillating upon each believer. Air and fire, subtle and imponderable to the ancient, were most fitting analogues to the presence of the Spirit.

In vv. 5-11 we have probably before us as audience the devout men of the race gathered for the feast from every quarter, therefore only temporarily *dwelling* at Jerusalem. We might accept the opinion of some who would expunge the word "Jews" in v. 5, and therefore regard this multitude as proselytes come up to worship with the Jews; but this conflicts with the plan of the work, which depicts the reception of proselytes as the result of a later special divine suggestion or command (viii. 26-39, and x. *passim*), so that *Jews and proselytes*, v. 10, may be counted an insertion.

The citation of nations in vv. 9-11 is on the whole geographical, the list beginning with Parthians in the far East and extending to Rome in the West, but there are deviations. *Asia*, v. 9, was a small province in modern Asia Minor, in the western portion; its limits were indefinite. See comment on xvi. 6.

The Glossolaly.—The traditional opinion that the phenomenon had its ground in the capacitation of the Galilean believers to speak languages unknown, one person or small group one speech and another another, is supported by the rendering of *ἑτέραις γλώσσαις*, v. 4, as *in other languages*, and the representation that all the multitude understood, v. 6. But according to the most natural interpretation of vv. 8 and 11, each hearer could understand every speaker, and according to

vv. 13 and 15 the speech was not understood by some as miraculous and foreign, but a clumsy indistinct utterance in one's native speech. Hence some have supposed the miracle to be one of hearing, not of utterance; the words were all Aramaic, but understood by others each in the language of his residence. But this is opposed to the general representation, which makes the disciples, not the multitude, the recipients of the wonderful influence. Wendt suggests that the word *γλωσσαις*, v. 4, is to be taken literally, as in v. 3, that each was thus provided with a miraculous organ of speech. One may rationally conclude with Pfeiderer that the historical phenomenon was the glossolaly depicted by Paul, ecstatic unintelligible speech (1 Cor. xii., xiv.), a trace of which appears in vv. 13 and 15. This was subsequently magnified by tradition, and by the author of Acts—or in the written source he used, as Spitta suggests—the incident is elevated to the position of a special manifestation of the Spirit, a determinative event in which the new law is proclaimed to the world in universal speech; as according to legend the Mosaic code was uttered from Sinai in a divine voice heard by every nation in its own tongue. Thus conceived the narrative bears the inclusive features of Pauline universalism.

The Pentecostal Discourse of Peter; theme; this phenomenon of speaking with tongues, the fulfilment of prophecy wherein also the death and resurrection of Jesus were foretold, is proof of the Messiahship of the Nazarene; ii. 14-36.

Verses 15-20 give the reason for the command to listen; this spectacle is not intoxication but a fulfilment of prophecy, a sign of the last days.

*The third hour* (v. 15) is 9 A.M. The Jews usually drank wine only with flesh and this they were not accustomed to eat until evening: Ex. xvi. 8; 1 Thess. v. 7. The citation, vv. 16-21, is Joel ii. 28-32, quoted from the LXX, with minor changes; the prophet announces in the midst of famine that if the people repent Jehovah will turn their hunger into fulness, and pour His spirit upon all, while Tyre, Edom, Egypt, and Philistia shall be desolate.

That great *day of Jehovah*—in prophecy pre-eminently the day of the moral sifting of Israel—is, in New Testament eschatology, the Parousia or return of Christ from heaven.

To *call on the name of the Lord* (v. 21) here denotes the acknowledgment of Jesus as Messiah or Lord, and to "be saved" signifies to escape the pains and penalties which Jesus as Messiah and therefore righteous judge will inflict upon the wicked and contemners at his Parousia. That this salvation is assured is now maintained by the assertion that the Lordship of Jesus is demonstrated by the resurrection, and by this outpouring of the Spirit which comes from the risen and ascended Messiah, vv. 22-26.

*A man approved of God*, etc. (v. 22): a man who was the agent, not the originator, of the wonderful works, and who by his resurrection and exaltation had been completely established as Lord and Messiah, v. 36. This is a clear enunciation of the adoptionist or humanitarian Christology, found also in Mark i.; the earliest type. (See Weiss, *N. T. Theol.*, § 39, c.)

*Being delivered up* (v. 23).—It was of the utmost moment to the apostolic defence to prove that the capture of Jesus, the condition of his passion, was not only allowed by God but ordained by Him. It was not therefore a triumph over Jesus, a proof of his weakness or unwisdom. In the Fourth Gospel even Judas becomes an apostle chosen by the omniscient Christ for the specific purpose of betrayal: John xiii. 18.

*Ye did slay*: the odium of the deed is put upon the Jews, not the Romans.

In v. 24 the resurrection is made as inevitable as the passion, and this necessity is grounded, not on the transcendent nature of Christ, but on a prophecy, quoted in vv. 25-28 from Ps. xvi. 8-11, where the pious post-exilic author (see Cheyne, *Bampton Lectures*, 197, 198) affirms his faith in the nearness of Jehovah, in deliverance from peril of falling into death or Hades (see Revised Version, Ps. xvi. 8-11); this passage is now adapted, vv. 29-36, so that David as prophet, now buried in Jerusalem (1 Kings ii. 10), does not discourse

of himself, but speaks of Messiah as delivered, not from descent into Hades (death), but from detention in it until corruption of the deserted body sets in; and the Psalmist's safety and glad communion of the living with Jehovah here becomes the exaltation of the risen Christ with God, on his right hand. In vv. 34, 35, we have further proof of the exaltation of Christ in the citation of Ps. cx. 1, a song of a poet of the Maccabean era concerning the reigning priest-prince or an ideal Messianic ruler who conquers enemies by Jehovah's assistance; here interpreted to denote the heavenly exaltation and co-regency of Messiah. On the Christology of v. 36 see comment on v. 23.

This discourse probably had some written source, but the author's style appears also in it. Its greatest value is in its exemplification of the early apostolic defence of Christianity, its method of Old Testament use and exegesis, of which Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* is a more elaborate specimen.

The immediate results of the outpouring of the Spirit and the address of Peter are delineated in vv. 37-47; enquiry, instruction, conviction, baptism, great enthusiasm, large additions, ideal communion of fellowship and property.

The baptism *into the name of Jesus Christ*, v. 38, was the earliest formula. (See, for Pauline usage, Rom. x. 9; 1 Cor. i. 13; xii. 3.) Baptism was probably immersion, not however of necessity (see *Teaching of XII. Apostles*, ch. vii.); that into Father, Son, and Spirit is a post-apostolic innovation.

The number *about three thousand* (v. 41) is indeed indefinite, but is shown by v. 44 to be traditional enlargement; this new accession (*they*, v. 42,) entered upon four Christian activities: *doctrine* or the instruction given by the apostles, *fellowship* or practical harmonious activity, *the breaking of bread* or common social-religious meals (*αγαπαί*), *prayers* or common hours of devotion in the temple, v. 46.

*Fear came upon every soul (v. 43)*; the impression made upon non-disciples. The brotherly impulse and practice of the new faith are delineated in vv. 44-47.

**The Healing of the Lame Man in the Temple, iii. 1-10.**

*The hour of prayer (v. 1)*, about 3 P.M. The door of the temple called *Beautiful (v. 2)* was probably the gate on the eastern side of the outer court, the gate of Nicanor, according to Josephus made of Corinthian bronze. *In the name of Jesus Christ (v. 6)*: the use of the name of Jesus in exorcism or healings had become custom in the time of the author, or his source. In the spurious conclusion of Mark xvi. 17, Jesus himself is made to authorise or prophesy such use.

*The portico that is called Solomon's (v. 11)*, a long colonnade with a double row of pillars on the eastern side of the temple area.

**Discourse of Peter.** He assures the multitude that the healing is not from himself and John (v. 12), but from God through the Jesus whom they denied (vv. 13-16). This denial was in ignorance (v. 17), was premeditated (v. 18), but now repentance is demanded (v. 19), and acceptance of the risen Jesus as Messiah, prophesied in the Old Testament (vv. 20-24), since to them, as historical heirs of the promises, salvation is offered first (vv. 25, 26).

*He answered (v. 12)*, a Hebraism, meaning he "began to speak."

*Our own godliness*; that piety procures an answer or granted petition from Deity is a prevalent Biblical idea; Ps. lxvi. 18, 19; Prov. xv. 29; John ix. 31.

*Hath glorified (v. 13)*; by granting such healing at the utterance of the name of Jesus.

*Servant (v. 13) (παῖς)*, a favourite designation of Jesus Messiah, apparently unfamiliar to the apostolic generation but found in many second century writings; the Servant passages of Deutero-Isaiah (xli. 8; xlii. 1; xliii. 10; xlix. 6; lii. 13 ff.; liii.) came to be regarded as prophetic of Jesus,

and were widely used in controversies with Jews; see Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*, *passim*.

*Whom ye delivered up*, etc.; the emphasis lies upon "ye"; contrast between Jewish rulers and Pilate.

Verse 14 is antithesis of 13; *God* glorified Jesus, *ye* denied him.

*The Prince of life* (v. 15): a life-giver, antithesis of "murderer" (Luke xxiii. 18, 19) in preceding verse. The *faith* (v. 16) is the faith of Peter and John, not that of the cripple; the pronouncing of the name by believing disciples.

*I wot* (v. 17): I am convinced; conciliatory.

*That his Christ should suffer* (v. 18). In the new interpretation of the Old Testament, wrought out by the early Christians, all the prophets, whose utterances were regarded as an organic and harmonious whole, came to promulgate the idea of a suffering Messiah. This interpretation, made upon a false idea of Scripture, under stress of conflict, has dominated and distorted even modern scholarship. On the question whether the Jews knew a teaching as to a suffering Messiah, see Schürer, *Gesch. des Jüd. Volkes*, ii. 464.

*Repent ye therefore* (v. 19): inference from 17 *f*. The *second* coming, or Parousia, must be preceded by repentance; it is the *first* coming of Messiah in glory, as judge and life-giver; the *times of refreshing* are the Messianic blessedness, introduced by the Parousia (as Heb. iv. 3-11), and conceived as laid up in heaven (as Matt. vi. 1; 1 Cor. ii. 9), therefore it *shall come from the presence of the Lord*. Of these times of refreshing the sending of Jesus Christ the risen is a first feature; his exaltation to heaven and temporary stay there was a divine necessity (v. 21). The *times of restoration of all things* (v. 21) is, as the *times of refreshing*, a designation of the Messianic blessedness, which was thought to be a return to the primitive perfect condition of Gen. i., ii. This fact of prophecy is now proven by citation of Deut. xviii. 15, 18, 19; which in the original referred to a successor of Moses, or

a succession of prophetic guides, but is here interpreted as a prediction of the coming Jesus, and the consequence of unfaith in him is expressed in citing Gen. xvii. 14 as a threat of exclusion from the impending Messianic glory. In the final appeal, *vv.* 25, 26, there is use of Gen. xii. 3, in which the word "seed" is referred to Jesus, not the nation; in Gal. iii. 16, Paul so uses the verse. *Unto you first (v. 26)*; a Pauline thought, as in Rom. i. 16; ii. 10; the *raising up* of his *Servant*, since it precedes or accompanies the sending, denotes earthly origin, not resurrection.

The first conflict with the Jews. Peter and John are arrested, brought the next day before the Sanhedrin; Peter preaches Christ; the two apostles are prohibited further utterance; they refuse to obey, return to the believers, who pray for divine assistance in the refusal, and are answered by a sign; iv. 1-31.

*They spake (v. 1)*; in iii. 12-26, it is Peter only who speaks. The functioning *priests* were disturbed; the captain of the temple feared disorder; the *Sadducees* were irritated at the teaching of the resurrection. The Pharisees are unmentioned, the author represents them as not hostile; see comment on xxiii. 6-8. *The number of the men came to be about five thousand (v. 4)*. Since in ii. 44 and vi. 1-6, the disciples appear to be in one room or space, this estimate is to be regarded as traditional enlargement.

In *vv.* 5, 6, we have a description of the factors composing the Sanhedrin: *Annas* was a former high-priest, 6-15 A.D., still called such by courtesy,—though the author may have believed him to be still in function—; five of his sons filled the high-priestly office, and a son-in-law, *Caiaphas*, was now high-priest, 18-36 A.D.; *John* was one of the five sons just mentioned, and *Alexander* is thought by Von Soden to be the Greek name of Eleazar, another son. *In what name (v. 7)*; see comment on iii. 6.

*Full of the Holy Spirit (v. 8)*; a special accession of power,

in fulfilment of Lk. xii. 11, 12. In proof that this divine power is mediated through Messiah Jesus, prophetic use is made of Ps. cxviii. 22. The Psalm is a Maccabean Hallel, 160-130 B.C., in which the stone is the Jewish people; here the stone is Messiah.

*Salvation* (v. 12) is deliverance from calamity in the Messianic judgment; since Jesus is Messiah he can deliver his own: the second clause is simply heightening the first by adding the name.

*A notable miracle hath been wrought through them* (v. 16): the disciples were the visible earthly means; the name of Jesus was the derived cause, v. 10; the power of God the ultimate ground, v. 21. The point of view is the prevalent *semi-supernaturalism* which regards the event as divine in proportion as it deviates from the ordinary; the healing was wonderful because the man was old, v. 22. The prayer of vv. 24-30 is a free composition, for the occasion, not a current formula recited in concert; vv. 25, 26 are a quotation of Ps. ii. 1, 2, in Greek, a post-exilic utterance in which Gentile rulers are represented as gathered in hostility to Israel, its Lord and Messiah; here in v. 27 Herod and Pilate are regarded as fulfilment, the order, Herod, Pilate, Gentiles, Israel, being anti-climax.

*The place was shaken* (v. 31).—A sign of the divine approval.

**The Life of the New Community.** The union of believers extends even to property; of genuine disciples Barnabas is the type; of spurious, Ananias and Sapphira, who are smitten with sudden death; iv. 32 v. 11.

On the socialism of the Church at Jerusalem, see note at end of ch. ii. The section 32-35 is probably composite; v. 33 more naturally follows v. 31; v. 32 contains a different conception from vv. 34 f.

*Barnabas* (v. 36).—A prominent disciple, born in Cyprus;



mentioned often in ch. xi.-xv., also by Paul in Gal. ii.; at an early day in Jerusalem, later at Antioch; inducts Paul into missionary work; toils with him; attends council of Jerusalem with him; parts finally from him in a temper, sailing for Cyprus. Late, unreliable tradition makes him founder of the church in Milan, missionary and martyr in Cyprus. In the structure of the book of Acts Barnabas serves as a medium of transition from Peter the chief actor of the first, to Paul the sole actor of the second, part.

He represents here the ideal disciple, who brings his wealth and lays it *at the apostles' feet*, v. 37, as does the false *Ananias*, v. 1 *f.*; the apostles are conceived as official leaders, of supreme power.

The rebuke of Peter, implying supernatural knowledge, proceeds upon the hypothesis of private ownership. The *lie* is designated in v. 3 as *to the Holy Spirit*, in v. 4 as *unto God*, in which Zöckler finds proof of the Trinity!

The whole incident is dismissed by Pfeleiderer as "allegorical fable"; but the inclusion of Sapphira indicates some historical basis; in pure allegory Ananias would have sufficed as antithesis of Barnabas. The rationalistic physico-psychological explanation: heart disease and intense emotion, is intelligible and possible, but the author wished to represent the deaths as a divine judgment upon deception and greed. The objectionable moral and the improbable historical features are in part due to tradition and a community not yet in accord with the spirit of Matt. xviii. 15-17; Lk. xvii. 3 *f.* when applied to the relations between the Heavenly Father and His children. O. Holtzmann's view, that the deaths were judicial executions for violation of a rigorous communistic law, finds no support in the present text.

**The apostles before the Sanhedrin.** The healings by the apostles rouse the priestly Sadducees against them; they are imprisoned and miraculously delivered by an angel; when brought before the Sanhedrin they still defy its prohibition to teach the new doctrine, and are saved from death by the counsel of Rabbi Gamaliel; they are scourged and dismissed, but still teach; v. 12-42.

The confusion in *vv. 12-15* (v. 14 is contradictory to v. 13 and sentences in *vv. 12* and *15* have indefinite subjects) is probably due to mixture of sources, and if v. 14 be omitted the representation gains in clearness. Zöckler would avoid the contradiction in *vv. 13, 14*, by translating "multitudes" (*πλήθη*) as "minor groups"! The over-statements in the section, as in the parallel case of Paul, *xix. 12*, are after the manner of Luke and Oriental tradition in general.

*An angel of the Lord (v. 19)* is not, according to the manifest meaning of the narrative, "some fellow-disciple of the prison guard"; mere disciples do not speak in such mandatory fashion to apostles; the reference is to the supposed inhabitants of the heavenly world. Angelophanies abound in the Old Testament, in Revelations, and in parts of the Lucan writings, *Lk. i., ii.; Acts xii.*; this instance is the more enigmatic because apparently useless; the apostles are at once again arrested; and since it is improbable that no notice of the miracle should be taken in the investigation which immediately follows, it is probably a later feature, and was inserted to give especial point to v. 29, "*we must obey God.*"

*This life (v. 20)* is the new Life of the Messianic age; the command to speak *in the temple* indicates that the apostles, not the scribes and rabbis, are the genuine, God-appointed teachers.

*The council* and *all the senate (v. 21)*; both terms mean the same; senate (*γερονσία* here alone in the New Testament) is probably inserted from some special source; according to Zöckler "a half-poetic pleonasm."

*Bring this man's blood upon us (v. 28)*: to cause the perpetrators of the deed to be punished; see *Matt. xxvii. 25*. The apostolic "teaching" must therefore have included an attack upon the Jewish authorities for their condemnation of Jesus. See *ii. 23, 36; iv. 10, 11*.

*Hanging him on a tree (v. 30)*; a current apostolic phrase to designate the act of crucifixion; see *x. 39; Gal. iii. 13; 1*

Peter ii. 24. It is an adapted Old Testament phrase; see Gen. xl. 19; Deut. xxi. 22; Josh. x. 26. On the Christology of v. 31 see comment on ii. 22, 23.

*Gamaliel* (v. 34): Rabban Gamaliel the elder of Jewish history and tradition, grandson of the famous Hillel; in xxii. 3 Paul is made to describe himself as Gamaliel's pupil; Paul's own writings are silent.

*Theudas* (v. 36): Josephus, *Ant.* xx. 5, 1, mentions a rebellion of Theudas in 44-46 A.D., some years therefore after the time of this Sanhedrin session. Josephus, as a Palestinian, is more probably correct in his chronology. There is no historical support for the opinion that there were two insurgents of that name. The analysts (Weiss, Clemens, Hilg.) regard the notice as an insertion.

*Judas of Galilee* (v. 37) was according to Josephus a Gaulonite, a zealot and patriot, who instigated a revolt against the Roman power on the occasion of the enrolment under Augustus, 7 A.D.

The allusion to Theudas and Judas is a logical enthymeme in which the conclusion is suppressed. When the leaders perished the movements soon collapsed; Jesus is dead, therefore wait; the verses 38, 39, contain the usual Jewish teleology; nothing happens without its cause in the divine will; whatever actually takes place is to be accepted as pre-determined. The beating of the apostles, v. 40, is an advance beyond iv. 21; they threaten, then they scourge; rapid alienation.

The whole section contains difficulties which find their partial explanation in the hypothesis of a defective early source worked over by a writer far removed in time and place. The incidents of the two arrests in chapters iv. and v. may be different presentations of what was but one conflict with the Jews: some scholars regard them as taken in part from xii. 3-17. (See Weiss, *Einleitung*, § 50, 2, note; English translation, ii. 338.) Ramsay (*St. Paul*, pp. 364-372) regards chapters i.-v. as taken from an inferior source and containing "episodes that savour of the popular fancy."

**Appointment of the Seven Deacons.** There being inequalities in the daily distribution of the food or food fund, seven disciples are chosen to manage the tables; vi. 1-7.

*The Grecian Jews* (v. 1) were Jews by race, born and reared in lands where Greek was spoken; the difference in language and training brought the first serious discord into the socialistic endeavour.

The *twelve* (v. 2) are the apostles, here only so designated, who appear as preachers; the new or special conditions demand new classes of assistants. The *seven men* (v. 3) were such in number either because seven was ideal and sacred; or because there were seven wards in Jerusalem; or because the church had seven places of meeting in the city. The selection is by the whole church; the apostles are not participants; the names in v. 5 are Greek, but since Nicolaus is designated as a proselyte the natural inference is that the others were Grecian Jews.

The current opinion is that we have here the origin of the Christian diaconate; since the function of the seven was the care of the poor, the office would naturally be continued, and the elders of xi. 30 are not identified with the persons mentioned. But these are nowhere called *διδασκάλους*; if they were officials in control of alms in the *whole church* we should expect other than Hellenists to be chosen; the Essenes, who were socialistic, had similar officials; Stephen and Philip appear later as evangelists. It is very probable therefore that we have here a temporary arrangement, growing out of transient conditions connected with the socialistic experiment and abandoned with it in the persecution which soon followed.

Stephen the Hellenist and the first persecution. He disputes with other Hellenists who bring him before the Sanhedrin on the charge that he blasphemes the temple and the law: he defends himself and so attacks and angers the Sanhedrin that they stone him to death, persecute and scatter the church; vi. 8-viii. 3.

*The Libertines* (vi. 8); probably Roman Jews once captives who had purchased their freedom and returned to Jerusalem. Cyrene and Alexandria on the African shore, Silicia and

Asia on the Asian, had large numbers of Jews among their citizens.

The accusations, vv. 10-14, are quite similar to those against Jesus, Matt. xxvi. 59-61; the difference between vv. 11 and 13 may be due to sources used.

The speech of Stephen, the longest in the Acts, is no verbatim report; it stands in a peculiar relation to the accusations of vi. 11, 13, 14, since it is not on its face a defence against the charges of blasphemy of Moses or opposition to the temple or the law. Whether its theme be regarded as the disobedience and ingratitude of the chosen people (Baur, Pfleiderer), or Moses as a type of Messiah (Spitta), or the freedom of revelation from bonds either to the holy land or the temple (Wendt), there is much that is not closely related to any one proposition. It abounds in citations from, and allusions to, the Old Testament; its use is however of the Septuagint and of a tradition more removed from the Hebrew; and its deviations in many cases closely resemble Philo and Josephus, suggesting either familiarity with these writers or use of a common Midrash; its characteristics are rather those of a calmly prepared discourse (save in vv. 51-53) than of a popular defence against specific charges. It is most reasonable then to suppose that its basis is some written source or material found by the author and adapted to its present situation. A writer freely composing a speech for his hero on some tragic occasion would have given it more verisimilitude.

In the following historical survey the Old Testament allusions and quotations are very numerous; the Hebrew narrative is usually followed, the chief deviations will be noticed.

*The God of glory* (vii. 2).—From Ps. xxix. 3. The *glory* is the bright cloud-like luminous splendour in which the theophanies take place; it both conceals and reveals Deity, or divine beings.

*Before he dwelt in Haran*; the author follows Philo and Josephus: Gen. xi. 1-xii. 5 places the theophany in Haran; Gen. xii. 1 is quoted in verse 3. God reveals Himself outside the sacred land.

*When his father was dead* (v. 4); another Midrashic divergence; since according to Gen. xi. 26, 32; xii. 4, Terah lived sixty years after the departure of Abraham.

*Three score and fifteen souls* (v. 14); so the Greek text of Gen. xlvi. 27, and Ex. i. 5; the Hebrew text has *seventy*.

*They were carried over unto Shechem* (v. 16); the Genesis narrative is silent; the mention of Joseph's bones (Josh. xxiv. 32) appears as an exception; Jacob is buried in *Hebron*, Gen. xlix. 30, l. 13; it is *Jacob*, not Abraham (Gen. xxxiii. 19) who buys land at Shechem.

The statements as to the beauty and learning of Moses in vv. 20-22 are not in Exodus, but see Philo's *Life of Moses*.

The angelophany of, or at, the bush, vv. 30-34, is cited to show that divine revelations may occur outside Palestine or Jerusalem.

With a demonstrative (οὗτος) five times used Moses is portrayed and exalted as a prototype of Christ in vv. 35-40; Moses was a rejected fellow-countryman, a redeemer, leader and sign-worker, prophet, lawgiver; in v. 38 the law comes through the mediation of an angel (as Josephus, *Ant.* xv. 5, 3) while in Exodus it is received directly from Jehovah: the word *church* is intentionally used as denoting on the one hand the *assembly*, the historical mass-meeting at which the law was given; on the other the pre-existent "church in the wilderness," to become historical in the Christian organism; the *living oracles* are at once the Mosaic law and the new Christian content obtained by allegory.

*The book of the prophets* (v. 42); the twelve minor prophets were written on one scroll and regarded as one book; the quotation is Amos v. 25-27, in which Moloch is the

fire-deity of the Ammonites, and *Rephan* is supposed to be Saturn. The original has Damascus instead of *Babylon*.

In *vv.* 44-50 we have a contrast of the movable tabernacle of Israel's early days, made after the heavenly pattern by Moses, Ex. xxv. 40, with the fixed and therefore inferior building erected by Solomon. The emphatic position of the negative (*οὐχ*) in the original: "*Not* does the Most High in hand-made temples dwell," and the following citation of Isaiah lxvi. 1, 2, show that the true sense lies in the *entire rejection* of the Solomonic temple, not in an expression of the "only relative value of the temple edifice" (Wendt).

The direct attack of 51-53 is sudden and unmediated, as if from another source, and addressed to the populace rather than dignitaries: in 19, 38, 44, 45, "our fathers," here "your fathers."

That in the section vii. 54-viii. 3 two sources are used is probable because (a) the stoning of Stephen is twice mentioned; (b) viii. 1 comes in as an interpolation between Stephen's death and burial; (c) in viii. 1 the disciples are scattered, but in v. 3 they are still in Jerusalem. Other less palpable indications are present.

*He* saw the glory of God (v. 55); see comment on vii. 2. *Jesus* is *standing* as if to receive Stephen: martyrs did not descend to Hades, but ascended at once, see Rev vi. 9; the verse (56) is modelled after Lk. xxii. 69: non-believers would not understand the term *Son of man*, found here alone in Acts.

The death of Stephen is nobly delineated; somewhat after the crucifixion; see Lk. xxiii. 24, 46. The scene has some features of a popular mob, others of a legal proceeding. Obscurely amid the rapid rush of the mad executioners we discern the figure of the young man Saul; vii. 58.

*All* (viii. 1) is the frequent Lucan hyperbole: the phrase *except the apostles* modifies it; the idea of the apostles as a corporate unit is here. But viii. 1-3 is composite; see above after vii. 53.

The history of Stephen marks the break with the external cultus of the Jews, as the activity of Paul works out the departure from the law in its inner significance: the disciples and apostles appear no more in the temple. If in a wide sense the historical activity of Jesus may be said to tend toward the separation of temple from synagogue, Stephen may be considered as continuing that work and achieving that end for the new Christian synagogue, the church.

That a new source begins with chapter vi. is the opinion of most analysts. The author has used this with freedom, and in consequence the delineation is less unitary and clear. The death of Stephen was probably the result of a popular mob or riot; it lay in the author's plan, perhaps as found in his other sources of information, to represent it as the judicial act of the authorities: these features may be his insertion. The time of the events cannot be determined by the internal features; the space of two or three years after the crucifixion is probable. Much fuel had been collected and the whirlwind of persecution but flung its blazing torches wide to kindle flames elsewhere.

**Philip the Deacon and Evangelist.** Philip preaches at Samaria, heals many, converts many; the apostles send down Peter and John; Simon the Samaritan sorcerer endeavours to buy the gift of the Holy Spirit; Philip converts and baptises an Ethiopian eunuch; viii. 4-40.

*Philip* (v. 5); see vi. 5, xxi. 8. Spitta considers him Philip the apostle, but this does not agree with viii. 1 and 14. *The city of Samaria* is the old capital, destroyed by John Hyrcanus 109 B.C.; rebuilt by Herod 25 B.C., and named Sebaste.

*Simon* (v. 9); called usually Simon Magus; a noted enthusiast, magician, Pseudo-Messiah; born in Gitta, educated in Sebaste; called by Irenæus the father of all heresies; according to Justin worshipped by many Samaritans as a god. In the Pseudo-Clementines the Apostle Paul is travestied under the mask of Simon Magus.

*That power of God which is called Great* (v. 10).—The word *power* (δύναμις) here as in Rom. viii. 38, 1 Peter iii. 22, and Gnostic writers denotes a superhuman person, a higher order of being. If John iv. 29, be taken literally, the people



were very unstable; many believe Jesus, all hang on Simon, all are reconverted by Philip.

*The apostles sent unto them Peter and John (v. 14);* the natural inference is that Peter and John were sent to confer the gift of the Holy Spirit; this is confirmed by Simon's attempt at purchase.

*He was fallen (v. 16)* should be, *it was fallen*, the form is neuter. On baptism *into the name of the Lord Jesus*, see comment on ii. 38.

*They received the Holy Ghost (v. 17);* which must have manifested itself in some external fashion, as speaking with tongues, since Simon finds in the phenomenon something which can be made lucrative; a spirit rebuked by Peter, vv. 20-23; Simon's answer (v. 24) shows him alarmed rather than penitent.

Simon Magus becomes prominent in the second-century tradition as a semi-Christian Gnostic, heretic, or Pseudo-Messiah. The existence of the sect of the Simonians is proof of some foundation for this narrative and the later legends. Since in the Clementine literature Simon is a disguised Paul, Baur so interpreted this section; finding in it the legend of an attempt of Paul to purchase an equality with the original apostles, which the author refutes by placing the incident before Paul's conversion. Volkmar even found Simon's offered money to be Paul's collection for the church at Jerusalem; Schmiedel is inclined to believe that the surprising absence from Acts of mention of the important collection is due to the charge against Paul that by this means he tried to secure recognition. Despite all that Schmiedel (Article "Simon Magus" in *Enc. Bib.*) has accomplished, it still remains probable that the connection of Paul with Simon is from a time later than Acts; only hypercriticism can find in vv. 18-24 any assumption of apostolic rank by Simon: the proffer of money is made at Samaria, not Jerusalem, and to Peter and John only: surely the author of Acts was not such a wretched blunderer!

In the incident of vv. 25-40 the passage to missionary activity among Gentiles advances a step further; in vv. 3-24 it was the half-Jewish Samaritans, here it is an Ethiopian

Jehovah-worshipper, a proselyte, inwardly a Jew: Rom. ii. 29.

*An angel* (v. 26); therefore a divine command.

*Toward the south* is to be replaced by the marginal "at noon," because (a) the general direction is given in the words which follow; (b) the time was of chief importance, in order that Philip might meet the eunuch; (c) the linguistic usage of the Greek Old Testament favours this translation.

*Gaza*, an old coast city of the Philistines, destroyed 65 A.D.

The adjective *desert* may be the name of the road, "desert-road," or may refer to Gaza, destroyed when the author wrote, 80-100 A.D.

*Candace* (v. 27) is a class name for Ethiopian queens, as Pharaoh for Egyptian kings; matriarchy was prevalent in East Africa, and the *eunuch* was a prominent court-officer. The passage quoted (vv. 32, 33) is Isaiah liii. 7, 8, from the Greek text, which in v. 8 departs widely from the Hebrew, in which the thought is that the Servant (not Messiah) of Jehovah, *i. e.*, the prophet (or prophetic band), was unjustly treated and his humble, silent, unselfish suffering ignored by his own race. But in this connection *humiliation* is made to mean Jesus' consent to death; the *judgment taken away* is the removal of the ban or penalty of death, the triumph of the resurrection; the word *generation* means the disciples of Jesus, already numberless; the *life taken from the earth* is the heavenly life of the exalted Messiah.

This exegesis is specially instructive, as an illustration of the use the apostolic age made of the prophetic utterances. The Catholic Fathers equal their arbitrariness when they find in *generation*, v. 33, the unspeakable mystery of the eternal generation of the Son.

*The Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip* (v. 39); on the spirit (*πνεῦμα*, breath or breeze) of Jehovah as locomotive energy see 1 Kings xviii. 12; 2 Kings ii. 16; Ezek. iii. 14; viii. 3; Philip reappears to men at *Azotus* (v. 40), a more

modern name for the ancient Ashdod, near the sea, north of Gaza, half way to Joppa. *Cæsarea* was the old Phœnician fortress of Straton's tower, built by Herod into a magnificent city, named in honour of Augustus Cæsar: it became the seaport of Palestine; the residence of the Roman governors.

Philip is absent from the narrative x. 1-xi. 18, the scene of which is Cæsarea; in xxi. 8, on Paul's last visit to Jerusalem, Philip appears as a resident of Cæsarea; Acts xi. 1 and 19 do not agree with the apparent chronology of this narrative; it is probable that it is inserted here too early.

**The conversion of Saul.** Saul, journeying to Damascus, sees on the way a vision of Jesus, is led, blinded by its splendour, to Damascus, where a disciple named Ananias, instructed also by a vision, announces to him renewal of sight and the gift of the Spirit; ix. 1-19<sup>a</sup>.

*Yet (v. 1)* connects the narrative with viii. 3.

*Damascus (v. 2):* a very ancient city, some 150 miles N.E. from Jerusalem, lying in a fertile plain on the river Barada, "an indispensable harbour of refuge on the desert, the market of the nomads, the outpost of the Mediterranean world toward farther Asia"; cosmopolitan; contained many Jews: that Saul should suspect Christians there is evidence that the conversion of Saul is not to be placed too near the death of Jesus and the Pentecost which followed.

*A light out of heaven (v. 3):* the Glory or δόξα, on which see comment on vii. 2; see 2 Cor. iii. 18; Phil. iii. 2. Saul knows neither the presence nor the voice; the accompanying men hear a sound or voice but see no presence (so in the post-resurrection appearance only believers see Jesus).

In the Ananias-vision vv. 10-16, the word *Lord* denotes Jesus; the conversation is unusually familiar; the customary reserve disappears: in v. 12 another vision of Saul is indicated; since he is represented as physically blind, we have

here important evidence of the pure subjectivity of the vision state.

*To bear my name before the Gentiles and kings (v. 15).*—Noteworthy is the feature that Paul's destiny as an apostle to Gentiles is a heavenly secret, unsuspected by Paul: he is later on (xi. 25 f.; xiii. 2) inducted into this activity by Barnabas; contrast Gal. i. 15-17.

*There fell from his eyes as it were scales (v. 18);* this is a materialistic or realistic conception, like Lk. iii. 22; Acts ii. 3; vi. 15; characteristic of the author.

(a) The central fact of the narrative, ix. 1-19, the conversion of Saul by a divine appearance or revelation felt to be miraculous, is authenticated by Paul himself; Gal. i. 12, 16; 1 Cor. ix. 1; xv. 5-10. (b) The vision of Christ, according to Paul, Gal. i. 12, 16; 1 Cor. xv. 5-10, was not an ordinary sensuous reality, since for him the risen Christ was not of flesh and blood; of an inward yet real presence, Paul felt assured. (c) The conversion is three times narrated, in Acts, ix. 1-19; xxii. 6-17; xxvi. 12-18; the accounts do not indicate an ordinary bodily presence. Even in the materialising tradition of Luke-Acts, there are but the luminous splendour or δόξα (see comment on vii. 2), and the accompanying heavenly tone or voice, the bath-kol of the Rabbis; neither the ocular nor the oral phenomenon had any *meaning*, if any *existence*, for the companions of Paul; the free treatment, the divergences of the narratives indicate little interest in historical veracity; the ideal is the essential; the accounts contain thus suggestive hints that they go back originally, like the descent of the Spirit at the baptism of Jesus, to what was the inner experience of but one human soul. That experience was real, that vision a momentous fact, but visions as mental states and experiences have their physiological and psychological conditions, however obscure. Such a pre-condition is clearly indicated in xxvi. 14, "it is hard for thee to kick against the goad." In souls of ardent temperament great spiritual experiences are ever volcanic, and their expression shifting and unstable, the lava remains plastic because still heated from the fire within; it is therefore largely useless to inquire which narrative lies nearest the fact. Wendt's decision that the original lies in xxvi. has in its favour the absence of Ananias; but per contra the volubility of the bath-kol is a sign of remote tradition.

Paul in Damascus and Jerusalem, ix. 19<sup>b</sup>-31.

*Certain days* (v. 19<sup>b</sup>); an indefinite but brief period.

*Straightway* (v. 20); see note at end of section. The *Son of God* is the same as the *Messiah* of v. 22; the designation is found here alone in Acts.

The *many days* of v. 23 represent no extended time, because of vv. 26, 27.

On the plot against Paul's life, vv. 23-25, see also 2 Cor. xi., 32, 33, where the governor is represented as persecutor; perhaps at Jewish instigation.

On *Barnabas* (v. 27) see comment on iv. 36; on Grecian Jews, vi. 1; on Cæsarea, viii. 40. The words *and Galilee* (v. 31) are, with Blass, to be regarded as an early insertion; Galilee is elsewhere entirely ignored.

Acts here represents Paul as publicly preaching at once after his conversion, as driven from Damascus by persecution, and arriving at Jerusalem before the tidings of his conversion had become generally known, as being presented to the apostles by Barnabas, as publicly preaching and disputing there, until the disciples, out of consideration for his safety, send him out of Judea.

Paul himself states (Gal. i. 16-24) that he went at once after conversion into Arabia, returned to Damascus, only after three years went to Jerusalem to make Peter's acquaintance, saw only him of the apostles and James the Just, remained at Jerusalem fifteen days, was unknown by face to the Judean churches. The difference here becomes contradiction, and attempts to reconcile—such as Lumby's endeavour to find the Arabian residence and the "three years" in the "many days" of Acts ix. 23—are failures. But since there is no sufficient proof that the author of Acts had Galatians before him, he is not to be charged with intentional untruth.

**Peter as evangelist of the coast region.** Peter goes to Lydda, where he heals Æneas; to Joppa, where he restores to life Tabitha; to Cæsarea, in answer to the invitation sent by a centurion, Cornelius, who was bidden do this by an angel; at Cæsarea converts many Gentiles; returns to Jerusalem and secures favourable opinion for his course from the believers there; ix. 32-xi. 18.

*Throughout all parts (ix. 32):* the original, διὰ πάντων, is better rendered "among all believers"; he is visitor, superintendent. *Lydda* is the Old Testament Lud, near Joppa, later famous as the meeting-place of a synod which acquitted Pelagius, 415 A.D. *Sharon* is the plain in which Lydda and other near cities lay. The healing is modelled after the Gospel tradition, Lk. v. 18-25; Mk. ii. 1-12; is here unconditioned by the recipient's faith, as iii. 6.

*Joppa (v. 36):* a coast city of Palestine, nearly west of Jerusalem, the modern Jaffa.

The features of the incident, vv. 36-42, strongly resemble synoptic material, especially Mk. v. 21-24, 35-43; the message sent in haste, the putting forth of spectators, Talitha = Tabitha. Holtzmann still regards it as a variant of the Gospel tradition.

*Simon a tanner (v. 43)* is probably mentioned because residence with such persons—tanners necessarily defied Rabbinic restrictions as to legal purity—showed Peter's emancipation from Pharisaism.

*Cæsarea (x. 1):* see comment on viii. 40; the *centurion* was a captain; the *band* or *cohort* was a regiment, ten of which constituted a legion. There was an Italian cohort in Palestine about 69 A.D. *Cornelius* was a Jehovah-worshipper, "half-proselyte." On the vision as such, see comment on ix. 10, 12, and note after 19<sup>a</sup>. *On the morrow (v. 9):* the distance from Cæsarea to Joppa is about twenty-seven miles. The *housetop (v. 9)* was flat, the *sixth hour* was midday; noontide prayer.

*He fell into a trance (v. 10):* the Greek is ἔκστασις; the ecstasy is a mental condition in which there is a suspension of the normal functions of sense and motion; sensation-stimuli are almost entirely ignored; the will is passive; the consciousness is absorbed in a limited group of ideas, usually religious, which take the form of vision; in the case of martyrs there is sometimes entire insensibility to pain; after

the resumption of the normal mental state the contents of the vision can be recalled.

The features of the vision (a vessel let down *above him*, yet *into which* he could look, and the bath-kol) show that no objective presentation was made. The threefold action is for emphasis; so Peter denies Jesus three times, and at restoration is three times bidden feed or care for the flock. Whether the import of the vision is to show that the Levitical laws are no longer valid, or that the distinction between pure and impure men, or Jew and Gentile, no longer holds, is not clear; but vv. 28, 34, 35, and xi. 1-18 favour the latter hypothesis.

*The Spirit said* (v. 19); more inward revelation; product in more normal mental conditions.

*Cornelius worshipped him* (v. 25): he regarded Peter as a supernatural being, concealed as man, as the answer shows. See xiv. 11-15.

*Unlawful* (v. 28); forbidden by Pharisaic maxim, not the Mosaic law. Entrance into Gentile houses was not strictly forbidden, but rendered the Jew unclean; and the dietetic rules were so strict that many Jews in Gentile eating-places were confined to raw vegetable products.

The address of Peter (vv. 34-43) is a parallel of xvii. 22-31; the one a speech of Peter to Roman, the other a discourse to Grecian, Gentiles; the main thoughts of both are the same; one God, unity of mankind, a chosen man, through whose death and resurrection comes a judgment upon the world of men.

*God is no respecter of persons* (v. 34); the sense of vv. 34, 35, is that without respect to race reverent worship of God and righteous conduct are the conditions which induce Deity to grant access to the Messianic tidings of salvation. This piety and righteousness, exemplified by Cornelius, are pre-conditions, not equivalents, of belief in Christ.

*The word* (v. 36) is the Messianic proclamation.

On v. 38 see comment on ii. 22.

In vv. 39-43 are contained the apostolic qualification and mission,—the plurals “we” and “us” are not a modest substitute for “I” and “me”—which so dispose the hearers to belief that *the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word*, v. 44; and indeed produced the phenomenon of glossolaly, on which see note after ii. 13. Here alone, vv. 44-48, the giving of the Spirit precedes baptism or the imposition of hands.

The justification of his action by Peter, xi. 1-18, is largely a repetition of the contents of ch. x.

*The Gentiles (xi. 1)*: the case is made programmatic by the author; as if the act were an important new departure.

It is noteworthy that the objection, v. 3, is not that Peter admitted Gentiles to Christian faith, but that he entered into intimate social relations with them, contrary to Mosaic or Pharisaic precept. The answer of Peter is a defence of his admittance of them on the ground of their reception of the Spirit from God. In v. 16, the reference is to i. 5; the original refers to Jews, this adaptation relates to Gentiles; but the argument is that since the Spirit is given by God to believers, those persons who receive from Him the Spirit are thereby proven such.

The resultant harmony (v. 18) is upon the question of the reception of Gentiles; see comment on v. 3.

The historicity of the Cornelius episode was denied by the school of Baur, who himself asserted that it was an invention of the author for the purpose of showing that Peter preceded Paul in the Gentile mission: it is still affirmed (Schmiedel, “Cornelius” in *Enc. Bib.*) that had this event occurred as narrated the council at Jerusalem (Acts xv. and Gal. ii.) could never have been necessary.

(a) It may be conceded that legendary elements are present.

(b) The prominence given to the event, as shown in the length, circumstantiality, and repetitions of the account, is due to its significance in the eyes of the author as a step in the passage of the Gospel from Jew to Gentile. That process included the offer of salvation, (1) to



pure Jews (ii.-vii.); (2) to Samaritans (viii. 1-25) as semi-Jews; (3) to the Ethiopian eunuch (viii. 26-41) as a proselyte, a Gentile become a Jew by circumcision and acceptance of the law, temple-Jews in faith; (4) to "God-fearers," Gentiles of monotheistic faith and ethic (x.-xi.), Cornelius and his household, synagogue Jews in faith; (5) to pure Gentiles, Greeks (xi. 19-27), having no previous connections with Jewish faith or practice. The significance was therefore that classes (1), (2), (3) were Jews (for there could be no opposition to the admission of proselytes), and classes (4) and (5) were Gentiles; and the case of Cornelius was typical and important, since between (4) and (5) the difference was slight from the legalistic point of view, and the preaching to, and admittance of, pure Greeks as to religion is passed over lightly.

(c) It is therefore incorrect to say that the question here involved is the same as that of the council, xv. 1-29. In this case the emphasis lies upon the *pre-conditions*; shall the Gospel *be offered* to God-fearing Gentiles? shall they be regarded as fit to receive faith, shall they be admitted to discipleship? The whole significance of the vision and its explanation lies here (x. 34, 35); it refers to *non-believers* and the pre-conditions of their first discipleship. In the Antiochian dispute and the council, xv. 1-29, the question referred to believers, "brethren" (xv. 1) and conditions of *permanent discipleship*. Paul had been preaching many years, *admitting Gentiles* to discipleship with the acclaim of the Judean churches, Gal. i. 22-24; the *new attempt* now made (Acts xv. 1; Gal. ii. 2-9) was to compel disciples, such as Titus (Gal. ii. 3), to take further steps into Jewish legalism. The decision at Jerusalem is represented as published to disciples in xv. 23; and the fact that Paul was not seriously troubled about the situation until fourteen years had passed proves that the believers in Judea had raised no weighty objection to his *admission* of Gentiles unpledged to legal observance.

(d) The fact that the account of Cornelius is taken from some source or sources indicates that it cannot be a pure invention of the author of Acts, made up for the purpose of a distortion of the real course of events. Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles, did not entirely abandon his own race; Peter may well have occasionally passed its fleshly limits.

(e) The whole section indicates a degree of confusion of two questions: (1) Shall God-fearing Gentiles be invited to accept the Gospel and received by faith? (2) If they are received, shall Christian Jews omit the observance of the Mosaic law so far as to enter into inter-

course of table and fire-side with them? (See comment on xi. 3 and 18.) The latter problem was the cause of much disturbance (see Gal. ii. 11 *ff.*); and Pfleiderer is inclined to the belief that the historical kernel of this episode belongs to a period later than the apostolic council.

**The Origin of the Church at Antioch; xi. 19-30.**

From the conversion of Gentile Jehovah-worshippers the progress is now made to the admission of pure heathen, and a Gentile centre of Christian activity is established. The circle widens. The section continues and elaborates the movement of viii. 4.

*Phenicia* (v. 19); the coast region north of Palestine.

*Cyprus*; the third largest island of the Mediterranean, 150 miles long, north-west of Palestine, some 200 miles away.

*Antioch*; of Syria, on the Orontes, sixteen miles from the sea; a great city, Greek in its type of civilisation. Here the work of winning as converts pure Greeks, adherents of the old religions, is done by nameless Grecian Jews, men of the Diaspora, from *Cyprus and Cyrene*.

*The church which was in Jerusalem* (v. 22); the persecution (viii. 1, 3; xi. 19) did not continue long; Paul soon after found Peter and James at Jerusalem; Gal. i. 18, 19.

*Barnabas* (v. 22): see comment on iv. 36.

*Christians* (v. 26); the name appears also xxvi. 28, and 1 Peter iv. 16; its rare appearance in the New Testament proves that it was not in early or wide use; it is common in the second century; it may be safely inferred that it was of Gentile origin; it may have been first used in derision.

*Prophets* (v. 27); the Christian prophets were wandering or travelling teachers, whose chief function was exhortation and teaching, 1 Cor. xii. 28; xiv. 29, 32; Eph. ii. 20; iii. 5; iv. 11; sometimes they predicted events.

*Agabus* (v. 28) is again mentioned, xxi. 10, 11, in the "we"-source.

The *great famine* refers doubtless to the Syrian famines of 44-48 A.D.; *all the world* is Lukan hyperbole.

The *elders* (v. 30) appear to be Christian officials, as money would naturally be sent to authorised officers; one wonders why deacons are not mentioned here as recipients and distributors.

That there was a church founded by nameless evangelists early in Antioch, that it was predominantly Gentile, that Barnabas and Paul were active there, may be accepted as certain. The official sending of Barnabas, his control of Paul, the intimacy of relation between Antioch and Jerusalem, are later additions due to the author or his source.

That Paul was in Judea (vv. 29, 30) before the council of ch. xv. 1-5, is emphatically disproved by his own words, Gal. i. 18-ii. 1.

Unsatisfactory are the harmonising attempts or explanations: (a) Paul went to *Judea*, v. 29, not *Jerusalem*, because of Herod's persecution. This is contrary to xii. 25. (b) Paul went to Jerusalem, but since his visit was brief and unimportant, he omits mention of it in Gal. ii. 1. (c) Paul was selected to go, but in some way prevented. The author knew of the selection, but was ignorant of the prevention, so represents him as going. McGiffert and Schmiedel maintain that this journey is one and the same with that of xv.; but that the author was misled by his sources into the belief that there were two.

**The Second Persecution at Jerusalem.** Herod Agrippa causes James the apostle to be put to death, Peter to be arrested; Peter is miraculously delivered; Herod soon dies at Cæsarea; xii. 1-25.

*Herod the king* (xii. 1); Herod Agrippa I., grandson of Herod the Great, ruled as king over all Palestine from 41 to 44 A.D. Favouring the Pharisees, he probably at their insistence persecuted the Christians. The explanation of his presence in Jerusalem lies in v. 3; *those were the days of unleavened bread*, i. e., the Passover, during which judicial processes were suspended, therefore, v. 4, since Herod could not pass sentence on Peter, *he put him in prison*.

*Of the church* (v. 5); i. e., by the church.

*Mary* (v. 12) is not elsewhere mentioned; *John Mark* may

appear nameless in Mk. xiv. 51; appears in Acts and Pauline Epistles as follower of both Peter and Paul.

*It is his angel (v. 15)*; not simply a messenger sent by Peter from the prison, the disciples could not expect such, but his guardian angel, transformed in form and voice into an image of Peter. The belief in guardian angels was widespread.

*James (v. 17)* is to be regarded as James the brother of Jesus.

*And he departed and went to another place (v. 17).*—The traditional interpretation, since the days of Eusebius, finds this *other* place in Rome. Here Peter disappears from Acts, save in the narrative of the council, ch. xv.

*Cæsarea (v. 19)* was Herod's capital; see comment on x. 1.

*Tyre and Sidon (v. 20)* were large commercial cities and received much of their food supply from Palestine.

The death of Herod (*vv. 21-23*) is narrated in some detail in Josephus, *Ant.* xix. 8, 2. It occurred at Cæsarea from peritonitis.

Verse 25 continues the narrative of xi. 30.

This narrative resembles in many features v. 18-23 and xvi. 25-34. In vv. 9 and 11 there are significant traces of mental confusion on the part of Peter. Other features, such as the events in the reign of Herod and the home of Mark, are authentic; the line between history and legend is imperceptible.

**Missionary Journey of Barnabas and Paul.** Set apart by the Spirit Barnabas and Paul journey to Cyprus, where Paul rebukes and blinds Bar-Jesus, a sorcerer; they cross to Asia, at Antioch after Paul's address many believe; but a Jewish persecution drives them to the cities of Lycaonia; at Lystra Paul is stoned; having made many disciples they revisit the new churches and return to Antioch of Syria; ch. xiii. and xiv.

*Prophets and teachers (xiii. 1)*; the verse designates those permanently connected with Antioch, in contrast with the visitors mentioned xi. 27.

On Barnabas see comment on iv. 36; Simeon, Lucius, and Manaen are unknown; probably Manaen and Saul, who form the second group—as shown by *τε—ναλ*,—were prophets; see comment on xi. 27.

The source here used regards Paul as still Saul a teacher.

*As they ministered to the Lord and fasted* (v. 2); active service is regarded as worship; the fasting is the author's addition, as in v. 3.

*The Holy Ghost said: i. e.*, spoke through a prophet. Barnabas is first in rank until v. 43; Saul is now called Paul, v. 9, and takes precedence, save in xiv. 14 and xv. 12.

*Seleucia* (v. 4) is the seaport of Antioch: on Cyprus see comment on xi. 19.

*Salamis* (v. 5) was a city on the southern coast of Cyprus; the John mentioned is the same as he of xii. 12.

*They proclaimed the word of God in the synagogues of the Jews.*—The author of Acts represents this as the uniform policy of Paul, xiv. 1; xvi. 13; xvii. 2; xviii. 4; xix. 8. The regularity is rightly put to the account of the author's theory, but Paul's interest in his countrymen, his hope of their salvation, even his expectation of himself saving some of them, Rom. xi. 14, as well as the opportunity of meeting there devout Gentiles, may well have often turned his feet to the synagogues.

*Paphos* (v. 6) is situated at the western end of Cyprus.

*Bar-Jesus* (v. 6): *i. e.*, Son of Jesus, a magician and wise man; such men were not simply fraudulent jugglers, the element of wisdom and ethical interest is denoted by the phrase, *a false prophet*.

*Sergius Paulus* (v. 7) was an official having consular authority in the island; a recently discovered inscription (see Ramsay, *St. Paul*<sup>3</sup>, 74) confirms this statement. The pro-consul may well have been a man of discernment and of inquiring mind.

*Elymas* (v. 8) is probably Arabic, meaning "wise man."

The narrative is a parallel of viii. 9-24, insofar as both Peter and Paul on a first missionary tour meet and vanquish magicians. Despite evidences of historical veracity there are curious coincidences. The pro-consul's name is Paul; Saul's name is here changed to Paul; both Bar-Jesus and Saul have two names; some features closely resemble Saul's conversion. See Schmiedel on Bar-Jesus in *Enc. Bib.*

*Pamphilia* (v. 13) was a coast province of Asia Minor; *Perga* its chief city, on the river Cestius near its mouth; famous for its temple of Diana. Continuing north, the missionary party entered the inland province of *Pisidia*, and at length reached Antioch, which, despite its name, really lay in the more northerly province Phrygia; it was founded by Alexander's general Seleucus, who induced Jews (about 300 B.C.) to colonise in it; the Jewish population was large.

The speech of Paul (vv. 16-41) somewhat resembles in structure and material that of Stephen in ch. vii. and of Peter in ch. ii., yet differs from both. Beginning with a sketch of Israel's history, touching on the ministry of John, it describes Jesus as the Messiah, and explains his death and resurrection as the fulfilment of prediction.

A departure from Old Testament statement in favour of a later tradition is found in vv. 19, 20, where the interval between the occupation of Canaan and the judges is given as 450 years; see 1 Kings vi. 1, where the whole period from the Exodus to the temple is 480 years.

*Saul's* reign (v. 21) is made to conform to those of David and Solomon.

The direct address (v. 26) indicates the presence of devout Gentiles, "those among you that fear God." It is noticeable that in v. 31 there is no mention of Paul's vision, 1 Cor. xv 8; the representation agrees with Acts i. 1-8; also that in v. 29 it is the Jews who place Jesus in the tomb. The quotation in v. 33, from Ps. ii. 7, makes that passage confirm the doctrine that the child Jesus became the Son of God on the day of his resurrection. So Paul, Rom. i. 4. Is. lv. 3 is

used, freely quoted, to show that the resurrection is assured, and Ps. xvi. 10—on the original of which see comment on ii. 31—is proven to refer to Jesus by mention of David's death, *vv.* 36, 37.

In the practical application, *vv.* 38-41, the Pauline doctrine of justification is stated poorly and negatively. The final quotation (*v.* 41) is of Hab. i. 5; the great work of Jehovah there depicted is the Scythian invasion; in the text it is interpreted as the Messianic judgment at the Parousia.

On the significance of *vv.* 44-48, see comment on *v.* 5, Rom. i. 16; ii. 10. They are inserted here as if they formed a *new* decision of Paul and Barnabas. The combination of necessitarianism and freedom in *v.* 46 has its parallel in Rom. ix-xi; where the election is shown to belong to a *transitional*, not a *final* stage of Providential design and activity.

The quotation, Is. xlix. 6, applies to Paul and Barnabas words which originally referred to the Israelitish prophets of the Babylonian captivity.

The phrase *ordained to eternal life*, *v.* 48, is a Rabbinic formula (Holtzmann), the product of the Oriental fatalistic spirit.

*Iconium* (*v.* 51): a city eastward of Antioch, belonging by turns to Phrygia, Lycaonia, and Galatia Province. (At this flight from Antioch the apochryphal *Acts of Paul and Thekla*, composed 160-170 A.D., begins its narrative.) Persecuted in Iconium, Paul's company continue a southerly course.

Both Spitta and Ramsay regard xiv. 3 as insertion or gloss.

*The apostles* (xiv. 4) must here denote the company of Paul, the evangelists, so in *v.* 14.

*Lystra* (*v.* 6) is by Sterrett, *The Wolfe Expedition to Asia Minor*, proven to have lain south-westerly from Iconium. The region was a portion of the political province of Galatia.

At Lystra, *vv.* 8-18, Paul heals a cripple (as Peter at Jerusalem, *iii.* 1-10); here faith is a condition, otherwise in *iii.* 5, 6; *v.* 15; the representation is similar also to Paul's speech at Athens, *xvii.* 22-31; the contents of the address in *vv.* 15-17 do not go beyond the limits of Jewish monotheism. The fact of the stoning is supported by 2 Cor. *xi.* 25; and the ill-will of the populace was a natural reaction from former veneration. The exemption of Barnabas is inexplicable. That on their return they *appointed elders in every church*, *v.* 23, and fasted on laying hands on them, is an insertion of post-Pauline custom into this earlier era.

The Pauline epistles know no elders in the official sense. But that Paul made some arrangements for the organisation of believers is probable, however soon he may have expected the Parousia.

*Attalia* (*v.* 25) was the port of Perga, see comment on *xiii.* 13. The return to Antioch indicates the completion of their special task.

That this was the first activity of Paul among Gentiles, the first distinct missionary labor among non-Jews, is stated or implied in *xiv.* 27. Therefore in the structure of Acts, this is a companion-piece of *x.* 1-*xi.* 18, which sets forth Peter's first activity among Gentiles; in the one case a distinct divine command, in the other the human factor in the form of Jewish unbelief; both are found in Rom. *ix.*, *x.* Paul now reports to the church at Antioch, as Peter at Jerusalem. The chronological disposition of this journey, *ch.* *xiii.*-*xiv.*, is one of the unsolved problems. Since Gal. *i.* 21 mentions only Syria and Cilicia as the regions of Paul's activity between his two visits at Jerusalem, Gal. *i.* 18 and *ii.* 1, many (*e. g.*, Weizsäcker, Spitta, Völter) place this journey after the council of Jerusalem, *ch.* *xv.* The absence of mention of this region in *xv.* 23 confirms this view. But in *xiii.* 2 Barnabas and Paul appear to be for the first time associated in the Gentile mission, in *xv.* 26, 35, they are represented as associated, in Gal. *ii.* it is a natural but not a necessary inference that Barnabas had been previously associated with Paul, certain that Paul had hitherto laboured among Gentiles; thus the evidence is inconclusive.

Still another vexed question is whether the churches mentioned in



xiii. 14-xiv. 23 are the same as those to whom Paul wrote Galatians. The matter is very complicated, and the reader will find thorough discussions in the articles "Galatia" in Hastings' *D. B.* and the *Enc. Bib.*; the former maintains the "South Galatian" position and the latter the "North Galatian." The general estimate of the book of Acts is not profoundly affected by the decision reached. In this commentary the "South Galatian" position is preferred.

**The Council at Jerusalem.** Members of the church at Antioch go to Jerusalem to consult concerning the imposition of the Mosaic law upon Gentile Christians. The apostles and elders of the church at Jerusalem decide to absolve the Christians of Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia from observance of the law and they so announce. xv. 1-34.

*Certain men* (xv. 1); a deprecatory expression; therefore the persons are unnamed, but Pharisees, v. 5.

The *brethren* were Gentiles, but admitted and accredited disciples.

This is a *new* demand, or condition of discipleship, or a condition of *effective* belief and life, necessary for complete participation in Messianic blessing.

*Declaring the conversion of the Gentiles* (v. 3): the case of Cornelius is unknown, the work of Paul and Barnabas a welcome innovation.

*Certain of the sect of the Pharisees who believed* (v. 5): since Jesus was a determined opponent of Pharisaism and incurred the deadly hostility of the Pharisees, this incoming must have formed a new feature and modified the church's life, therefore have introduced a new source of discord. To the demand for circumcision, v. i., is now added the new requirement, *to keep the law of Moses*.

It is not clear whether the gathering in v. 6 is the same as that indicated in v. 4.

The speech of Peter, vv. 7-II, refers to the conversion of Cornelius, x: 1-48 as a known event of the remote past, in which God wrought, as if for the first time, the conversion of

the Gentiles, their salvation through faith; declares the law an intolerable burden for Jews, therefore nugatory also for Gentiles; and affirms the principle of salvation by grace for Jew and Gentile alike: this is surely a Pauline presentation.

In *v. 12* Barnabas precedes Paul as here more prominent, since longer in the ministry to Gentiles; they are not leaders, are not there to argue, but simply to testify to God's approval of their work by *signs and wonders*.

*James (v. 13)* is the brother of Jesus (James the apostle was dead, xii. 2); he presents Peter's work in Cæsarea as a *first* visitation of Gentiles by God, and a fulfilment of prophecy; the passage cited (from the Greek translation) is Amos ix. 11, 12, where the reference is to the restoration of the Davidic rule.

*That we trouble not (v. 19)* ; *i. e.*, vex and annoy by imposition of the numerous mandates of the Mosaic law.

*The pollutions of idols (v. 20)*; participation in the corrupting sacrificial meals; *fornication* may denote here not unchastity, but marriages between relatives (Lev xviii. 6-21) or with unbelievers; the eating of the *strangled* and of *blood* is forbidden, Lev. xvii. 10-14.

In *v. 21* we have the reason for the imposition of the precepts in the preceding verse. Since the law had long been read among the dispersed Jews in their synagogues and was thus dear to them, it was necessary that no offensive customs should be continued by the Gentile Christians, because thereby the extension of the Gospel among Jews would be grievously hindered.

*Judas (v. 22)* is elsewhere unmentioned; *Silas* is probably the same person as Silvanus of the Pauline epistles; a companion of Paul in the narrative of Acts xv. 22-xviii. 5; thereafter unmentioned, he may yet have accompanied the apostle, and be the author of the "we"-document. The letter which follows, *vv. 23-29*, is addressed unto the Gentile Christians of the countries of *Syria* and *Cilicia* ; the author

thus limits the applicability of the decision; the letter itself is explained in the preceding verses.

Verse 34 is omitted in the most ancient manuscripts; it crept in because in verse 40 Silas is in Antioch; the inference that he had remained there became probably at first marginal note, then text.

The conference at Jerusalem presents one of the most important steps in the momentous transition of Christianity from Jew to Gentile, the Semitic to the Indo-European world. Alike the genius of Christianity and its historical circumstances speedily carried the new movement beyond the race limitations of its birth. Even in the Old Testament provision is made for the Gerim (strangers, sojourners, proselytes), resident among the chosen people, to acquire civil and religious rights, and to inherit, partially at least, the promised blessings. With the decay of heathenism and the dispersion of the Jews, the movement increased. Into the synagogues established in the chief towns and cities of the Roman world, there came multitudes of men and women, to join with the Jews in their imageless worship of the one invisible Deity, and to find strength in the lofty ethic of their exhortation. Josephus, Seneca, Dio Cassius, Horace, Juvenal, bear testimony to this wide-spread impulse. Judaism responded to this trend of heathenism. Even exclusive Pharasaism illogically "compassed land and sea to make one proselyte" (Matt. xxiii. 15); and the pages of Philo reveal how, in its attempt to gain the Gentile mind and heart, the synagogue flung aside that which was formal, local, national, or historical, and appealed to the for ever rational and the universal human. Thus arose a varied proselytism, a manifold adherence to the Jewish religion, from the observance of Sabbath custom or food laws on the one side to full incorporation on the other, for which latter there was demanded circumcision, baptism, and sacrifice or offering. Into these synagogues, filled with devout Jews and Gentiles, the first Christian preachers went. There could never have been for a single moment a question as to the admissibility of Gentiles to some kind of Christian fellowship; it is inconceivable that the disciples of Jesus could have outvied the Pharisees in exclusiveness. But the Christian message contained a distinct and important element which gave to the problem of Gentile admission an especial significance. The Parousia expectation, at once a soteriology and an eschatology, was here intense and all-determinative. In the usual Jewish

circles where the Messianic idea existed largely as a hope of future Jewish domination over the nations under ideal conditions, or where as by Philo it was rationalised and denationalised, or where it was entirely extinguished, the gain to be won by Gentiles through incorporation into, or loose attachment to, Judaism was mainly either intellectual and moral or was made vague by the dim indefiniteness of the eschatology. But the tense expectation of the Christians is in the *Maranatha* of Paul, "our Lord cometh"; and with that appearance, hourly awaited, would begin those supernal phenomena of resurrection, judgment, world-transformation, Messianic reign which meant unspeakable welfare and bliss to those who should participate.

In face of this the meaning of the word "salvation" changed and the antithesis became complete; men were to be admitted or omitted; gradations disappeared. On what conditions were Gentiles to share in this heavenly good? The answer of the conservatives at Jerusalem was, "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." To Paul with his teaching of salvation through grace and faith this was a gospel which was no gospel, alike false in principle and impossible in practice; since his Gentile converts would never yield, he might truly have run in vain. The powers at Jerusalem were wavering, he must go and secure a decision.

The point of departure for a consideration of the historicity of the narrative in Acts may well be a comparison with the account given by Paul himself, Gal. ii. 1-10.

Both narratives agree: (1) that Paul and Barnabas went up from Syria to Jerusalem; (2) that the cause of the journey was a dissension in Syria originating in Judea by the activity of "certain men" or "false brethren," who demanded the circumcision of Gentile converts; (3) that this contention was a new phase, interrupting a previous concord and seriously threatening the unity of feeling and progress of the churches; (4) that there were two interviews or conferences; (5) that the legitimacy and divine approval of Gentile Christianity were recognised; (6) that the demand for circumcision of Gentile converts was refused by the apostles; (7) that the outcome was fraternal relations and practical agreement between Paul and the apostles at Jerusalem.

Features peculiar to Gal. ii. 1-11 are: (8) that Paul went up to Jerusalem "by revelation"; (9) that one conference was "privately before them who were of repute"; (10) "that they who were of repute imparted nothing" to Paul; (11) that there was a division of the field of labour, in that Paul and Barnabas were to go to the Gentiles,

James and Cephas and John unto the circumcision; (12) that Paul and Barnabas were "to remember the poor"; (13) that Titus was taken along by Paul and an ineffectual demand made for his circumcision. Features peculiar to Acts are: (14) that Paul and Barnabas were sent as delegates from the Antiochian church to Jerusalem; (15) that "certain other" brethren were also appointed; (16) that both conferences were public, the whole church participating; (17) that a decree of the church at Jerusalem, proposed by James, adopted by the apostles and elders, was sent by Paul, Barnabas, Judas, and Silas to the Gentile Christians in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia, imposing upon them abstinence from things sacrificed to idols and from blood and from things strangled and from fornication.

Numbers (8) and (14) are not of necessity contradictory, but the statement in Acts is probably unhistorical; the omission of (13) from Acts may be due to a defective tradition, but is more probably intentional and Titus is concealed in the "certain other" of (15); it is difficult to believe that a matter to which so much importance was attached by Paul as (12)—for which see 1 Cor. xvi.; 2 Cor. ix.—could have entirely vanished by accident from the Pauline tradition in Acts; yet no sufficient reason for its suppression can be found. More difficult still is belief in the historicity of (17), both in its relation to (10) and as an element of, and the outcome of, the conference with Paul. For it may indeed be said that Paul had been instructing his Gentile converts to obey the regulations of (17), and that therefore nothing was added to the previous conditions. That is not in itself improbable. The Paul who could concede that the work of Peter in making converts among Jews who should be obligated to the Mosaic law was a divine activity, and who agreed that this procedure was to continue, who could write 1 Cor. x. or Rom. xiv., was himself not averse to concessions in matters of convenience and fraternal intercourse. But that he consented to, or was party to, a *demand* that his converts should observe these four legal conditions is not only disproven by his own clear words, but by the absence of any such precept in his letters to Gentile churches on these very matters; see Rom. xiv.; 1 Cor. viii. That the decree originated on some other occasion is manifest also from its terms. Paul had come to settle a principle *for the whole Gentile church*, as the first verses of this chapter in Acts also indicate; the decree is to Gentile converts in *Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia*, and concerns neither the question of admission or of salvation but that of fraternal convenience and table intercourse.

The natural conclusion then is that the author of Acts, who cannot

have invented the decree, since he would then have made its terms conform to the circumstances, found traditions of these two problems either already confused or in such vagueness as to lead to his erroneous apprehension. The unhistorical presentation of Paul as subordinate and the Jerusalem apostles as supreme must be due to some Jewish source, since the author of Acts is an admirer of Paul; the speeches are freely composed as is usual, and the strong tendency toward ecclesiasticism is a feature of the post-apostolic age imported by tradition into these early years.

Thus it appears that on the really momentous and fundamental problem, the imposition of circumcision and the full adherence to the law as a *condition of salvation*, both accounts concur that the leaders reached agreement and determined for ever the policy of the Church. In some quarters antagonisms long continued, as the Pseudo-Clementines clearly show. The practical outcome of the conference in the agreement, "we unto the heathen, they unto the circumcision," is a programme so vague, so illogical, so unfeasible, that it became an Interim as impossible as that of Charles at Augsburg, and the only explanation of its adoption is that in their deliberations they heard one voice supreme over all, "Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel until the Son of Man be come."

Interpreted geographically, it was obscure, for the limits of "Israel" were undefined; Palestine was full of Gentiles; the apostles would have become ministers to the uncircumcision or the Gentiles in Palestine been deliberately cut off from the Gospel message; Paul would have been banished and the apostles fenced in. Interpreted ethnographically, the consequences would have been more fatal; the apostles would have had no word for the God-fearing Gentiles in the synagogues; Paul would have banished himself from the house of prayer and the synagogue, crippled thereby his activities, made such words as 1 Cor. ix. 20 or Romans ix. 1-5 a lie or sounding brass; the result would have been two churches instead of one. It was soon abandoned; the delay of the Parousia and the logic of Christianity shattered the compromise; at length the missionary endeavour came to know no limitations of Greek or Jew, of bond or free.

**The Second Missionary Journey. A. From Antioch through the region of the first journey and westward to Troas. xv. 36-xvi. 10.**

During the *some days* (v. 36) presumably occurred the incident narrated in Gal. ii. 11-14. The hypothesis that the

author of Acts knew of this contention, to which Barnabas was a party, and invented the account in Acts xv. 37-39 as an equivalent, is not to be entertained. Simple omission of Gal. ii. 11-14 would have sufficed; the author inclines to idealise the past; only fidelity to tradition could have induced him to add this feature of *vv.* 37-40, in which the noble Barnabas disappears in a pet from the pages of Acts.

*For John also, who was called Mark (v. 37),* see comment on xii. 12; for the incident mentioned in *v.* 38 see xiii. 13. Barnabas now goes home (see iv. 36 and comment); Paul chooses Silas, the Silvanus of 1 Thess. i. 1, who accompanies him certainly as far as Corinth.

*Lystra (xvi. 1)* was reached by crossing the Taurus chain of mountains. There Paul finds a valuable helper and trusty friend, *Timothy*, who remains his companion—with occasional exceptions—until the end of his life. For notices in Pauline epistles see Rom. xvi. 21; 1 Cor. iv. 17; xvi. 10; 2 Cor. i. 1, 19; Phil. i. 1; ii. 19; Col. i. 1; 1 Thess. i. 1; iii. 2, 6; 2 Thess. i. 1; Philem. 1. In the pastorals: 1 Tim. i. 2, 18; vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 2. The *certain woman* was named Eunice, the grandmother Lois, according to 2 Tim. i. 5. Timothy was already a Christian and much esteemed. The statement that Paul secured his circumcision (*v.* 3) is not incredible. The apostle who could write “circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing,” 1 Cor. vii. 19; or “and unto the Jews I became as a Jew that I might gain the Jews,” 1 Cor. ix. 20, could easily, if he were logical, give advice *for* the circumcision of Timothy; the question was not here one of Timothy’s salvation or freedom; it was simply one of his usefulness to the Christian cause; his mother was a Jewess; the Jews in Phrygia were many. But if circumcision obliged him to keep the whole law (Gal. v. 3), he would have been less useful in a mission among Gentiles; there was already a favourable opinion of him; there is no sufficient cogency in selecting one Gentile and leaving others uncircumcised; the

connection with the following verse makes the doubtful tradition more doubtful.

Verse 4 refers to xv. 22-29; for its historicity see note after xv. 35.

*The region of Phrygia and Galatia (v. 6)* may include the northern journey in the historic Galatia, or the name Galatia may designate the Roman governmental province lying south and south-west of the older province. See note after xiv. 28.

*Asia* may denote here either the older province lying on the Ægean or the later and larger proconsular Roman province which included a part of Phrygia; in the latter case the Galatian region would naturally be the north Galatian region. *Mysia (v. 7)* lay on the Ægean in north-western Asia Minor; was a part of Asia; a journey northward to the east of Mysia would bring the missionary group to *Bithynia*, a province on the Black Sea and the Propontis. Now under a divine impulse which urges them westward the missionaries, *passing by Mysia (v. 8)*, *i. e.*, paying no attention to it, traversed its territory and came to the great harbour of Troas on its western shore. The city, properly called Alexandria Troas, lay near the famous Troy of Homer's Iliad, but is not to be confounded with it, and was at this time a prosperous Roman colony.

*A vision appeared to Paul in the night (v. 9)*; divine communications were regarded as made in dream visions. This plunge into pure Greek heathenism was a momentous act, rich with precious fruitage. For the vision see note on ix. 19, and comment on x. 10.

#### B. Paul in Philippi, xvi. 11-40.

*Samothrace (v. 11)*, an island, "a huge boulder planted in the sea," on the water route between Troas on the Asian shore and *Neapolis*, the seaport of Philippi which lay ten miles inland; a Roman city of the first rank in Macedonia.



*A river side* (v. 13); the small stream Gangus flows through the town, and synagogues were, for purposes of lustration, placed near water.

*Thyatira*, see comment on Rev. ii. 18.

*A spirit of divination* (v. 16): literally, "having Python as a spirit." Python was the ancient name of the Greek Delphi, as well as of the fabulous dragon which dwelt there; the word came to be applied to ventriloquists and oracle-mongers, or the spirits supposed to inhabit them; "For Pythons prophesy and are cast out by Christians" (*Clem. Hom.*, ix. 16). As spirits they have supernatural knowledge; therefore the proclamation of v. 17.

For demoniacal possession, see vol. i. of this series, page 359.

*Being Jews* (v. 20); not simply Jews by race, since they could attain citizen rights, but Jewish innovators, wandering wonder-workers, disturbing the peace of communities; as such they are beaten and imprisoned until the next day, when they are released and requested to leave the city, vv. 23, 24, 35-40.

The narrative of vv. 16-24, 35-40, in itself credible, is confirmed by Phil. i. 30; 1 Thess. ii. 2; but the section vv. 25-34 is much less assured. (a) It interrupts the connection; (b) it is unmentioned, unused by Paul in vv. 35-39; (c) it is full of incredible features, such as the refusal of the prisoners to escape, the immediate attempt at suicide, the preaching and conversion in the nightly tumult. It may well—as by Weiss: *Einleitung*, § 50: 5—be regarded as a secondary tradition from some other source than the main narrative. Peter also has a prison experience, v. 17-42. That Paul—contrary to the impression made by this narrative—remained for a considerable time in Philippi is shown by his letter to the church; Phil. i. 3; ii. 12.

The "we"-source begins apparently at xvi. 11.

### C. Paul in Thessalonica, xvii. 1-9.

*Thessalonica* (v. 1); the modern Salonica, named for a sister of Alexander, was situated at the head of the Thermaic

gulf, was a populous commercial city and had therefore a *synagogue*, while Philippi had only a *place of prayer* (προσευχή). Here also the existence of a Gentile church (1 Thess. i. 9; ii. 14) warrants us in the belief that Paul must have remained there some time and extended his activity beyond the three synagogue sermons of v. 2. The reasoning of v. 3 has its parallel in Peter's speech, ii. 14-36; see note after ii. 36.

*Jason* (v. 5) may be the person mentioned Rom. xvi. 21.

On the persecution mentioned in the section, see 1 Thess. ii. 15, 16.

The narrative is apparently inserted as an illustration of the author's purpose to set forth the Jewish hostility which necessitated the Gentile mission.

#### D. Paul in Berea, xvii. 10-14.

The city lay some fifty miles south-west from Thessalonica (its harbour, Dium, is unmentioned; Ramsay, *St. Paul*, 70); it is the modern Verria. Despite the greater candour of the Jews, Paul is not reported as founding a church there. Jewish hostility, as before, forced him to leave the city, before which time, however, Timothy rejoined him.

#### E. Paul in Athens, xvii. 15-34.

In v. 16 Paul is represented as originally intending no stay at Athens, no missionary activity, but as incited to utterance by pure reaction against the vast idolatry of the city. In this centre of image-worship, where according to Petronius "it was easier to find a god than a man," it was only natural that the sight of temple and statue should rouse the soul of the stern monotheist to indignant protest.

*Devout persons* (v. 17).—Monotheistic Gentiles, frequenters of the synagogues.

*Jesus and the resurrection* (v. 18); the article before the

word resurrection may be omitted; the *strange gods* were Jesus and Resurrection.

*The Areopagus* (v. 19), "hill of Mars," was a towering mass of rock, west of the Acropolis, used in part as a place of meeting for a legal tribunal; hence is used for the tribunal itself; the original meaning is here more probable, since there is no evidence that the hearing was judicial.

The noble discourse which follows—itself a summary—treats of the divine unity, and is a fine assertion of idealistic monotheism. There is one God (v. 24); all the universe is thus from one cause (vv. 24, 25); humanity is one in nature (v. 26); one in religious aspiration (v. 27); ought therefore to come to a oneness of spiritual belief befitting their divine origin (vv. 28, 29); this oneness is also of sin and need of repentance (v. 30); as there is to be a oneness of judgment through Christ.

*Somewhat superstitious* (v. 22); the Greek adjective here used means "divinity-fearing," and is in the comparative; denotes therefore, as it is used in a complimentary or uncomplimentary fashion, either "more religious" or "more superstitious" than others. The first mentioned sense would seem most fitting, but the last clause of v. 23 gives decision in favour of the less complimentary use. The ambiguous term may have been purposely chosen.

TO AN UNKNOWN GOD (v. 23).—Similar dedications are found in the Vedas and among the Mexicans. Just this feature of vagueness—not as if the inscription expressed any monotheistic foreboding—is made the occasion for a definite assertion of monotheism, of the existence of one God, supernal, needing no temples; requiring no gifts from men, since He is the universal giver.

*And he made of one every nation of men* (v. 26): the word "man," *i. e.*, Adam, is to be inserted after the word one; "blood," in the old version, is a gloss. Greek anthropogeny favoured the idea of a multiple origin of humanity.

If in v. 24 the transcendence of Deity finds expression, His

immanence is emphasised in *vv.* 27, 28. The quotation is from Aratus of Soli in Cilicia and was written about 270 B.C.; but the phrase "certain of your own poets" indicates knowledge of similar passages in other Greek writers. Cleanthes, a contemporary of Aratus, expresses in his hymn to Zeus the same idea: "Being then living offspring of the living God, we ought not to worship lifeless creations of man as deities."

*The times of ignorance* (*v.* 30) are the past eras of idol faith and worship; the *repentance* is the turning from polytheism to monotheism. The ground of this call to repentance is the appointment of a (near) day of judgment upon the world by a man, Christ Jesus, whose resurrection affords assurance of his ordination as judge.

Since Paul's companions were absent, *vv.* 15, 16, and since the author of Acts composes freely discourses for his actors, this address may be regarded as in the main an ideal apostolic discourse over against heathenism as that of Stephen in chapter vii. is such an one over against Judaism. But the absence of specifically Pauline ideas is, before such an audience, no proof of non-authenticity; the fundamental ideas are found in 1 Thess. i. 9, 10; Romans i. and ii.; and the fact that the attempt ends in failure indicates some basis in reliable tradition. Of whatever authorship, the address is a noble testimony to the faith which vanquished the Athenian idols.

*Dionysius the Areopagite* (*v.* 34), *i. e.*, a member of the council which met upon the Areopagus, becomes in late and unreliable tradition the first bishop of Athens, the author of a voluminous literature which first appeared in Constantinople in the sixth century; and is identified with St. Denys of France.

#### F. Paul in Corinth, xviii. 1-17.

The narrative follows the stereotyped order: discourse in synagogue, incitement of Jewish hostility, awakening of Gentile belief, persecution, departure.

*Corinth* (*v.* 1), "the double-stranded city," situated on the

isthmus which connects southern Greece with the mainland, of great commercial activity, cultured, luxurious, sensual.

*Pontus* (v. 2), a province in Asia Minor upon the Black Sea.

The edict of expulsion by Claudius, the Roman emperor, is mentioned by Suetonius (*Claudius*, 25), whose statement that "Chrestos" instigated the riots which caused the rescript may obscurely indicate that the Christians were involved in the disturbances, since "Chrestos" the "good" may have been easily an erroneous form of Christos.

*Constrained by the word* (v. 5); preferably "engrossed," "completely absorbed"; encouraged by the presence of Silas and Timothy (see xvii. 14, 15) Paul now leaves the house of Aquila, abandons his secular occupation, and by his enthusiasm and persistence gathers the large church which afterward claimed and received much of his care. During this eighteen-month residence Paul wrote the epistle (or epistles) to the Thessalonians.

For parallel to v. 6 see xiii. 46.

*Gallio* (v. 12); a native of Cordova in Spain, elder brother of the famous philosopher Seneca, was proconsul of Achaia 50-55 A.D., an upright and tolerant ruler.

As such he dismisses the complaint against Paul. The sentence: *And Gallio cared for none of these things* (v. 17), is praise for his liberality over against the Jewish fanaticism.

#### G. The return to Antioch, xviii. 18-22.

*Cenchreæ* (v. 18); the seaport of Corinth on the eastern side of the peninsula, seven miles away. The precedence of Priscilla indicates that the subject of the masculine participle: *having shorn* (κείραμενος), is Aquila; it was he, not Paul, who had the vow, the consummation of which was marked by the cutting of the hair.

*Ephesus* (v. 19): the metropolis of Roman Asia, populous, important; situated on the left bank of the Cayster some six

miles from the sea; the seat of the famous Artemis or Diana worship; soon to become the scene of the extended activity of Paul; in later times the gathering place of great ecclesiastical councils.

It is possible to eliminate the visit to Jerusalem by regarding the *church* (v. 22) as the church at Cæsarea. It is surely remarkable that so important an event should be passed over so lightly (otherwise xix. 21); the famous last visit (xxi. 10-17) is represented as the first since Paul's great mission work began, and the visit here—if it be such—is without motive or result. The failure of Acts to mention clearly Paul's fulfilment of the agreement of Gal. ii. 10 may be the cause of this slight allusion, or one may with Wendt and Pfeiderer (see, *per contra*, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, 264-266) regard the mention as unhistorical.

**The Third Missionary Journey of Paul. A. Ephesus; xviii. 23-xix. 41.**

The journey toward Ephesus was by land through the regions already visited by Paul. The *region of Galatia* (v. 23) is probably the political Roman province of that name.

*Apollos* (v. 24) appears further in 1 Cor. i. 12; iii. 5; iv. 6; xvi. 12 as a worker in the church at Corinth, having become the leader of a faction of believers there.

*Instructed in the way of the Lord* (v. 25).—The paradox of the verse—that Apollos was instructed in the way of the Lord, yet knew only the baptism of John—may be explained by the hypothesis of a double source, or mistaken editorial insertion (McGiffert, *Apost. Age*, 291, who thinks that the author of Acts could not conceive of a Jew announcing an unnamed Messiah, as John and his disciples did, therefore added the confusing clause in v. 25); or by the somewhat forced exegesis which identifies the *things concerning Jesus* with “prophecies concerning Messiah” (Ramsay, *St. Paul*,

267). The same difficulty appears in the following chapter. See note after xix. 7.

When now the most important member of the school of John at Ephesus had been converted by Priscilla and Aquila, the remainder of the group became discipled by Paul; xix. 1-7

*The upper country* (xix. 1); the highland regions east of the coast-plain in which Ephesus lay.

*Certain disciples* (v. 1); the phrase must mean here disciples of John the Baptist (see v. 3); but that they are called disciples indicates some special and close bond between them and the Nazarenes. See note after v. 7.

*Whether the Holy Ghost was* (v. 3): the word *given* is rightly added by the revisers; John announced a coming baptism of the Spirit (Mk. i. 8; Lk. iii. 16); therefore not its *existence*, but its *descent* and *presence* were unknown. Paul's task (v. 4) is simply to convince them of the preparatory character of John's activity, wherein, as in the Fourth Gospel, the later estimate of the mission of the Baptist is set forth; and the apparent design of the narrative is to set forth that the presence and power of the Spirit, manifested in glossolaly, are mediated by Christian baptism and imposition of hands.

The *twelve men* (v. 7) may have been leaders, an apostolic group; hardly the whole company.

The whole section, xviii. 24-xix. 7, is problematic (even Ramsay says, "This episode I must confess not to understand"); and partakes of the mystery which still hangs over the history of the church of Ephesus in the apostolic and post-apostolic generations. Peculiar phenomena of the Fourth Gospel find their most rational explanation in the hypothesis that long after Paul's residence there was an important Baptist movement or influence still existent. (See Baldensperger, *Der Prolog des vierten Evangeliums*, 37-99.) Nowhere in the epistles of Paul is there any mention of the Baptist or his movement. The estimate of John and his mission here put into the mouth of Paul is the post-apostolic or later apostolic.

In *vv. 8-10* we have the usual formula (see comment on xviii. 5-8): offer of the Gospel to Jews, hostility, separation, activity among Gentiles. The residence of Paul in Ephesus continued for about three years (see xx. 31). Here he proved himself superior to the Jews in the working of wonders, *vv. 11, 12*; so that the Jewish exorcists imitate him by using the name of Jesus, *v. 13*, which results in failure for them, *vv. 15, 16*, but triumph for the Christian cause, *vv. 17-20*.

*Aprons (v. 12)* were worn by labourers when the loose outer garment was taken off. Perspiration was thought to have a healing energy; so also spittle (Mk. vii. 33, 35; John ix. 6-9;—as among the Babylonians; see Delitzsch, *Babel und Bibel*, zweite Rede).

*Seven sons (v. 14)*, probably disciples—since disciples were often called sons—of a magician. In *v. 16* there appear but two. Ephesus was famous for magic; even Christians, see *v. 18*, had continued to practise it. The *fifty thousand pieces of silver (v. 19)* were of about \$9000 value.

The section, *xix. 11-20*, is certainly of the nature of popular tradition. Since verse 21 follows well after 10, it would be natural to regard the section as an insertion from oral tradition or from some fugitive document. McGiffert (*Apostolic Age*, p. 286) dismisses it as "a curious tale"; and Ramsay (*St. Paul*, p. 273) concedes that the writer is here "rather a picker up of current gossip, like Herodotus, than a real historian."

Paul now (*vv. 21, 22*) proposes a journey: to Jerusalem that he may carry the funds collected for the poor, then go to Rome, perhaps to Spain, *Rom. xvi. 28*.

On Timothy see comment on *xvi. 1*. Paul's departure was thus not caused, but accelerated, by the riot which soon followed; *vv. 23-41*.

*Diana (v. 24)*.—At Ephesus, the centre of the Diana (Artemis) cult, stood the famous temple, one of the seven wonders of the world, of white marble, 425 x 220 feet, more



than 200 years building, the worship at which gave employment to many artisans in the construction of imitative temples made not alone of silver but of marble and terra-cotta; some of them have been preserved. Therefore the interests of business must be united against the idol-opposing religion; therefore the concealment of the real issue under an appeal to religious feeling; hence the mob. Diana (or Artemis, Cybele, Leto) represented the mystery of nature in her seeming death and revival, the ceaseless wonder of dissolution and reproduction.

*The theatre* (v. 29) was the place of concourse, built in a semicircle, capable of seating 50,000 people, roofless; it is still standing.

*Gaius* is said in xx. 4 to be of Derbe. *Aristarchus* was a frequent companion of Paul, xx. 4; xxvii. 2; Col. iv. 10.

*The chief officers of Asia* (v. 31).—The Asiarch was the president of the provincial diet of Asia, especially charged with the interests of the Cæsar cult, elected for one year but retaining the title after the office ceased; therefore many resided in Ephesus.

The part taken by *Alexander* is rendered uncertain by the various readings. Either he was a Christian put forward by the malicious Jews so as to become the victim of the popular fury; or he was a Jewish shrine-maker, fellow-craftsman with Demetrius, and wished to represent the interests of the artisans but was mistakenly silenced by them because of his Jewish physiognomy; or as a Jew he was put forward by the idol-despising Jews to defend them against the impending danger. In any case the attempt was a failure.

*The town-clerk* (v. 35), or city-secretary, is known by the inscriptions as a very important officer.

*Temple-keeper*; cities devoted to the cult of some deity or emperor were called temple-keepers; the image said to have fallen from Jupiter was a cedar or golden figure of the many-

breasted Artemis, daughter of Jupiter and Latona, a symbol of the fecundity of nature.

The position of the official (*vv.* 37-40) is that the persons complained of are apparently harmless and that all charges against them are to be settled before the established courts; this is the position of Trajan at the beginning of the second century. Thus again the Roman government either protects Christians or shows itself far from hostile.

**B. Church visitation; tour toward and unto Jerusalem; xx. 1-xxi. 17.**

During the journey mentioned in **xx. 2** Paul writes 2d Corinthians. The *return through Macedonia* (*v.* 3) was caused by knowledge of a Jewish plot to be executed on ship-board while his companions (*v.* 4) crossed from Corinth to Troas and there awaited him (*v.* 5). The words *as far as Asia* were omitted in many MSS., because at least Aristarchus and Trophimus accompanied Paul farther (xxi. 29; xxviii. 2). But since the "we"-narrative begins suddenly here, the phrase *but these had gone before*, *v.* 5, may refer to some persons previously mentioned in it, and the disciples mentioned in *v.* 4 may have gone with Paul by land. The mention of the localities whence these friends came, together with the stress put upon the collection in 2 Cor. viii. 1-ix. 15 (see Rom. xv. 32), renders it probable that the persons named and the unnamed "these" of *v.* 5 were to accompany Paul to Jerusalem with the funds raised among the Pauline churches, which Paul wished personally represented. 1 Cor. xvi. 3, 4; 2 Cor. viii. 18-24.

The account of the journey from Troas to Jerusalem is largely from the "we"-narrative.

*Troas* (*v.* 6), see comment on xvi. 8. *The days of unleavened bread* were the Passover in Mch.-April.

*To break bread* (*v.* 7) usually denotes to join in the Agape or common Christian social meal, of which the Eucharistic

observance formed a part; since this one was held on Sunday, *the first day of the week*, it was probably a special gathering.

In the narrative concerning Eutychus, vv. 7-12, the author evidently considered the lad dead, and thus the incident is presented as a miraculous recovery, as in Peter's miracle, ix. 36-41; but the form of Paul's utterance, v. 10, appears to indicate no return of life ( $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$ ), since there was no entire departure. From Troas the journey lay southward along the coast, to *Assos* (v. 10), twenty miles by land, thence to Mitylene, the capital of the island Lesbos; *the following* day—for, according to Ramsay (*St. Paul*, 293) a regularly recurring night-wind from the south obliges south-bound sailing vessels to tie up at evening—to *Chios*, another island fifty miles south, then to Samos, another island over against Ephesus, then twenty miles south-east to Miletus, a city at the mouth of the Meander. Here was more delay from adverse wind or much traffic and Paul determines to see once more the prominent members of the shattered Ephesian church.

Paul's discourse to the elders, vv. 18-35, contains (a) reminiscences of his life at Ephesus; (b) a prophetic glance into his future; (c) admonition to careful guidance and protection of the church; (d) exhortation to follow his example.

*The first day* (v. 18); see xviii. 19. *The plots of the Jews* (v. 19) may be included in 1 Cor. xvi. 9; they are unmentioned in Acts, unless the riot was the work of Jews. *Bound in the spirit* (v. 22): impelled by inward necessity.

*I know that ye all shall see my face no more* (v. 25): this is strong evidence that when Acts was written the author knew no tradition of Paul's release from imprisonment and subsequent activity in Asia Minor.

*Bishops* (v. 28); since the address was made to *elders* (v. 17) the identity of the two words ( $\piρεσβύτεροι$  and  $\ἐπισκοποι$ ) must in this case be granted, though bishops ( $\ἐπισκοποι$ ) may denote here simply "care-takers." The Catholic exe-

genesis, which asserts that the word here has its official meaning, and at the same time adheres to the doctrine of the single episcopate, is obliged here to put forth the unwarranted hypothesis that bishops from other regions were also present. The reading "of God" is doubtful; the margin more probable; the copyists have changed the phrase to accommodate it to the usage of the epistles; and the Fathers became fond of the expression the "blood of God."

In *vv.* 29, 30, there is a delineation of the subsequent Ephesian heresies and heretics in the form of a prophecy. The quotation in *v.* 35 is found in no Gospel; 1 Clement ii. 1 and Didache i. 5 are perhaps echoes of it; the same idea is in Ecclesiasticus iv. 36.

That this discourse contains some genuine elements is probable; but the Lucan style, the absence of definite circumstance, the certainty of no further visit, the apparent prevision of later heresies, the programmatic character of advice apparently given the whole church, and especially the defence in the form of self-praise,—all indicate clearly that here as elsewhere the traditional material has been freely worked over.

After the pathetic parting—the kiss is common among males in the Orient—Paul leaves for ever (*vv.* 25, 38) these scenes of his toil; and the course is southward, forty miles, unto *Cos* (**xxi. 1**), the southernmost of the large islands of the Ægean; thence easterly to *Rhodes* in the Carpathian; thence to *Patara*, a seaport of the province of Lycia; on southward of the great island Cyprus (see comment on xi. 19) unto the Phœnician city Tyre where was a church whose members also took final leave of Paul, *vv.* 4-6; then to Ptolemais or Acco, as commercial as Tyre, meeting-place of nations, battle-stained from the time of Thotmes III. the Egyptian, 1400 B.C., on through the campaigns of Artaxerxes, Ptolemy, Vespasian, Omar the Moslem, Baldwin the Crusader, Napoleon, until the guns of Britain won it in 1840 for the Sultan; thence to Cæsarea (see comment on viii. 40).

On *Philip the Evangelist* (v. 8) see comment on vi. 5, also viii. 5-13; 26-40; his prophetic daughters are strangely silent here—perhaps there is a lacuna in the text—; and from Jerusalem comes *Agabus* (v. 10) before mentioned, xi. 28, whose unavailing prophetic symbolic act is described after the manner of 1 Kings xxii. 11; Jer. xix. 1; 10-13.

*After these days* (v. 15).—Leisurely now (see also v. 10), in contrast with xx. 16, either because too late to be at the Pentecostal feast (Overbeck), or because of unexpected spare time (Ramsay), they move toward Jerusalem.

*Bringing with them one Mnason* (v. 16) is probably to be rendered "leading the way to one Mnason," etc. And since Jerusalem was two days' journey from Cæsarea Mnason's house may be regarded as the midway station. An old Western reading runs, "and reaching a certain village we were in the house of Mnason."

Paul at Jerusalem, xxi. 17-xxiii. 30. A. Paul and the church, xxi. 17-26.

*The brethren* (v. 17) are not the leaders, those he is to meet on the morrow; nor the church in general; but Pauline Christians. On *James* (v. 18) see comment on xv. 13. The collection is unnoticed. The impression given by v. 19 is that this is Paul's first visit since that of xv. 1-23.

*Thousands* (v. 20); literally *myriads*, is an Oriental hyperbole.

*Thou teachest the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses* (v. 21).—The situation was delicate, misapprehension inevitable. Paul had taught the freedom of Jew as well as Gentile from the Mosaic law (Rom. x. 4; xii.; Gal. iv. 1-11; v. 6; vi. 15); yet in Gal. ii. apparently concedes to the apostles to the Jews that they and their Jewish disciples shall continue to observe it. Personally he had among Jews kept the law, among Gentiles broken it, proclaimed to Jews its non-validity, yet counselled or at least allowed its observance:

true thus to his own conviction he had appeared in practice shiftily and evasive; thence had arisen the (false) charge that he taught Jews to abandon the law's most characteristic rites.

*Do therefore this*, etc. (v. 23): the proposition was that Paul should join himself to four poor Jews who had taken a Nazarite vow, become one with them as the custom allowed; assume the cost of the offerings and head-shaving necessary for a release from it; thus appear often in the temple (see v. 27), and bear open testimony to his obedience to the minute requirements of the law.

*We wrote* (v. 25); see xv. 20.

The historicity of this event has been denied since Baur's day by many scholars; it has been by them regarded as an invention of the author for the purpose of bringing Paul into nearer conformity with Jewish Christianity; its actuality was denied on the ground of incompatibility with the utterances of Paul in Gal. ii. 13, 14; v. 2-4. See Holtzmann, *Hand-Commentar*, 133 f.; Cone, *Paul*, 154-156. But, (a) it is evident from Gal. ii. that Paul conceded and expected that Jewish converts would continue to observe the Mosaic law if they desired; and Paul was himself a Jewish convert. Nowhere does he demand that Peter should advise his disciples to abandon it. (b) It will not be questioned that when Paul entered synagogues and Jewish private houses he observed as worshipper and guest—in part at least—the precepts of the law. (c) It is totally aside the mark therefore when criticism regards this narrative as completely incompatible with the Paul of the epistles, when it attempts a parallel with the supposititious cases of Calvin vowing on his death-bed a golden robe to the Mother of God or Luther officiating at a Catholic mass. To Paul the law was right in principle, "holy, just, and good"; but *inefficient*: to Luther the mass was wrong in principle and vicious in practice. (d) It is also *a priori* criticism to affirm that Paul could not have done this since it was inconsistent or illogical. Calvin accused Paul of weakness in this case. (e) Since the narrative furnishes an explanation of Paul's presence in the temple, there might well be some basis in fact for its appearance. The return of this aging man to the scenes of his spiritual youth and young manhood, the presence of the people whom he so loved and the institutions once so dear, may well have stirred

him most profoundly, and made participation in the familiar rites—to which he as a Jew had no objection on principle—an occasion of refreshment to his spirit. (*f*) The interpretation of Paul's purpose as deceptive, that he might convince the Jews of his *complete observation* of the law even when among Gentiles, may well be put to the account of the author or his source.

**B. The arrest.** Paul is discovered in the temple by Asian Jews, seized, dragged from the temple, beaten, rescued by the Roman officials; xxi. 27-36.

*The seven days* (v. 27); the connection is obscure; no such definite time had been mentioned, though such may be implied in v. 26; yet the seven days are not demanded in the law. There may be here the beginning of a new source. The *Jews from Asia* were from Ephesus and vicinity, xix. 9; xx. 19; they recognised Trophimus in the city; see xx. 4; that Paul had brought Greeks into the temple was an unjustified inference.

*They dragged him from the temple* (v. 30); because it was illegal to take human life there.

*The chief captain* (v. 31) was Claudius Lysias, xxiii. 26; commandant of the Roman cohort stationed in the tower or castle of Antonia (v. 34).

**C. The defence before the populace and its results ; xxi. 37-xxii. 29.**

*Art thou not then the Egyptian*, etc. (v. 38): Josephus (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 13, 5) gives us information of a false prophet from that region who during the procuratorship of Felix, 52-60 A.D., gathered a band of enthusiasts twenty thousand in number and led them to the Mount of Olives, promising them that at his word the walls of Jerusalem would fall and the hated Romans be delivered into their hands. Felix dispersed them with great slaughter.

*The Assassins* or Sicarii, "dagger-men," were bands of

fanatical robbers who about this time infested Palestine. See Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, ii. 13, 5.

*The Hebrew language* (v. 40) was the Palestinian Aramaic; Hebrew proper was no longer the popular tongue.

In this first defence (xxii. 1-21), Paul cites the facts of his Jewish birth, strict training in the law, persecution of disciples of the Nazarene; he justifies his course by presenting it as simple obedience to two heaven-sent visions, in one of which Jesus makes him a disciple, in the other bids him leave Jerusalem as hopeless and preach to the far-off Gentiles.

*Gamaliel* (xxii. 3), see comment on v. 34.

*As also the high priest doth bear me witness* (v. 5).—Former high priests continued to bear the title. As this arrest was 18-25 years after Paul's first visit to Jerusalem as a Christian, the high priest of that period, Jonathan (the John of Acts iv. 6) may have been living. He was assassinated by the Sicarii at the instigation of Felix.

*A trance* (v. 17), see comment on x. 10.

On vv. 19, 20, see comment on vii. 58; viii. 3.

*Depart* (v. 21); the departure was therefore due to a divine command, received in the sacred temple; this is divergent from the reason assigned ix. 29, 30.

This fragment of a discourse—for v. 22 represents it as such—has its parallels in ix. 1-30, with which it is in general agreement (for differences comp. ix. 7 with xxii. 9, ix. 28-30 with xxii. 17-19), and xxvi. For relations of the three see note after ix. 30. The discourse is in the Lucan style, and its pertinency is widely questioned. Paul may have attached undue weight to his own visions as certification of his contention. It is extreme therefore to say with Weizsäcker that the discourse is "unthinkable" as addressed to Jewish non-believers, but it must be conceded that it would have little weight save with Christians, that it is at least somewhat improbable that Roman military rigour would have allowed a procedure so liable to increase the riot. The insertion of the account, whether or not historical, is in accord with the general purpose of the author to contrast Jewish vehement hate with Roman mildness.



*Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman ?* (v. 25); scourging of Roman citizens was forbidden by ancient law: Livy ii. 8; ix. 10. This right of citizenship Paul's father had in some way obtained; the freedom given the city of Tarsus did not confer rights of Roman citizenship.

**D. The hearing before the Sanhedrin; xxii: 30-xxiii: 11.**

The commandant, still unsatisfied concerning the charges against Paul, calls together on the morrow the Sanhedrin and sets him in the midst.

*Ananias* (xxiii. 2), high priest from about 47-59 A.D.; greedy, thrifty, murdered by the Sicarii; 65-6 A.D.

*Whited wall* (v. 3): hypocrite, see Matt. xxiii. 27; the whole outburst is defended by some as prophecy

*Contrary to the law* (v. 3); there is no explicit Mosaic command supporting Paul's position; Lev xix. 15 is too general.

*I wist not, brethren, that he was the high priest* (v. 5); too apologetic are the explanations, (a) that the high priest was not in the place of the presiding officer; (b) that Paul's eyesight was poor so that he did not recognise the speaker; (c) that the phrase "wist not" means "was inconsiderate." The words are ironical, a sharp thrust at the prejudice, the spiteful temper, shown by the highest ecclesiastic; such a man God's high priest!! The Old Testament quotation is Ex. xxii. 28; lxx.

*But when Paul perceived* (v. 6); the word "perceived" (*γινώσκω*) is better rendered "reflected"; as the Sadducees and Pharisees were not distinguishable by vision.

The *Pharisees*, a party rather than a sect, believed, in opposition to the Sadducees, in oral tradition, personal immortality, resurrection, angels, demons, predestination; and vigorously opposed foreign influences. See verse 8; Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. 1-3.

*I am called in question* : i. e., I am called before this court.

To the ensuing tumult, in which the Pharisees actually champion Paul (as Gamaliel did Peter before the Sanhedrin, v. 33-39), the chief captain puts an end by forcibly bringing Paul back into the castle.

The real charge against Paul was infidelity to his race and its religion, xxi. 28. Zöckler confesses that Paul's attempt to make it appear as belief in the resurrection is "Einseitigkeit," onesidedness or distortion; though he tries to free it from the malodour of deception. If the section were a pure invention of the author it would have had more decisive character; would have displayed Jewish hatred and bigotry over against Roman moderation. There is some basis of fact. But since it contains traditional features, since there is little probability that such a body as the Sanhedrin could have been brought into such a digression by so transparent a device, since the moral aspect is so unpleasant,—we may regard the narrative *in its present form* as unhistorical; and its insertion as due to a racial tradition in which the delight in shrewdness and subterfuge found unethical expression, as in the legends of Isaac and Jacob.

The whole section appears interposed; see below, comment on v. 12.

#### E. The conspiracy and departure; xxiii. 12-35.

The clear and intelligible narrative demands little explanation.

*The Jews* (v. 12), the *high priests* (v. 14), the *whole council* (v. 15) appear here as involved in the conspiracy against Paul; in entire oblivion of, or conflict with, the division presented in xxii. 7-10; a trace of the composite origin; but xxiv. 21 mentions the event.

*Paul's sister's son* (v. 16): the only mention of Paul's relatives.

On *Cæsarea* (v. 23) see comment on viii. 40. The *third hour of the night* is nine P.M.

*Felix the governor* (v. 24) was a manumitted slave, brother of Pallas the famous favourite of the Emperor Claudius, was cruel, crafty, contemptible, married, after going to the Orient, Drusilla the daughter of Herod Agrippa I.

*After this form (v. 25):* a letter from one Roman official to another would probably be written in Latin. This is Lucan in conception in that it represents the commandant as shielding Paul against Jewish hatred.

*Antipatris (v. 31)*, a city some forty miles from Jerusalem on the road to Cæsarea, built by Herod the Great and named in honour of his father. Here Judean authority ceased.

*Cilicia (v. 34)* was then an imperial province, therefore Paul's case was to be heard before an imperial court.

*Herod's palace (v. 35)* or prætorium; built by Herod the Great and thus called by his name; used by Roman governors.

**Paul's Imprisonment in Cæsarea. A. The trial before Felix.** The prosecutors come from Jerusalem; Tertullus accuses; Paul defends himself. Felix defers decision; xxiv. 1-27.

On *Ananias (xxiv: 1)* see comment on xxiii. 2. The *orator* was a prosecutor, Tertullus is else unknown. The flattery (*vv. 2, 3*) was customary. The charges against Paul (*vv. 4-9*) were three: (*a*) stirring up disorder and sedition in the Roman empire; (*b*) acting as ringleader of a sect; (*c*) profaning the temple at Jerusalem.

Paul's defence is a denial of having fomented any disturbance at Jerusalem, a confession of his Christian life, a declaration of his purpose in coming to Jerusalem, a complaint of the absence of the Asian Jews, the real instigators of the attack against him, an assertion that the Sanhedrin did not convict him of wrong-doing; *vv. 10-21*.

*Many years (v. 10)*; about seven. For the *twelve days* see xxiv. 1 and xxi. 27; the alleged motive, *to worship*, needs correction or completion from Rom. xv 25-27; since the collection was most important.

In the confession of his Christian life Paul includes no mention of Messiah. The kernel of the new *Way* is belief in the resurrection, and life in this new Way is a truly legitimate Judaism.

*To bring alms to my nation, and offerings (v. 17)*; a general Jewish religious motive; see comment on verse 10; even in xxi. 26, the offerings were not in the original design; see xxi. 24, 25; it is improbable that the word *alms*, limited as it is by the phrase *to my nation*, refers to the collection mentioned in the epistles.

*Having more exact knowledge concerning the Way (v. 22)*; the clause appears to contain a reason why Felix should render decision at once; a better rendering of the Greek participle is "although he had more exact knowledge"; he could well decide now, but wished to procrastinate so as to avoid offence to the Jews.

*Drusilla (v. 24)*, see comment on xxiii. 24.

The reasoning of Paul concerning *righteousness, self-control, and the judgment to come* was the more unpleasant, since Drusilla, now scarcely more than sixteen, queen-wife of Azizus of Emesa, had deserted her royal husband and married Felix, whose "cruelty and lust" deserved the scathing words of Tacitus, as they were prominent among the incitements to the Jewish rebellion of 66-70 A.D.

*Porcius Festus (v. 27)*; governor 60-61 A.D.; earnest and sincere; died in office.

**B. Paul before Festus.** Accused again by the Jews, Paul affirms his innocence, refuses to submit his case to the Sanhedrin, appeals unto the emperor; xxv. 1-12.

The *principal men (xxv. 2)* are members of the Sanhedrin; the *favour (v. 3)* ostensibly lay in the avoidance of a journey to Jerusalem; since they were many, it was more suitable that Paul should come to them at Jerusalem.

The sin *against Cæsar (v. 8)* was probably the fomenting of disorder. All the charges are denied as before; xxiv. 10-21.

*Wilt thou go up to Jerusalem? (v. 9)*; as a Roman citizen Paul could demand a trial before Roman courts alone;

Festus proposes that since the charges largely concern Jewish law and custom the trial shall be by the Jewish court under his supervision, "*before me*," v. 9, which proposal Paul rejects, as was his right; v. 10.

*I appeal unto Cæsar* (v. 11); the governor could sentence to capital punishment, but to Roman citizens the right of appeal to the emperor was granted (Schürer, *Gesch. des Jüd. Volkes*, i. 390). The conviction that his situation was dangerous; the fear that a decision by Festus might be influenced by local political considerations; the desire to go to the far West; the fine reputation of the young Nero, whose rule under the influence of Burrus and Seneca was as yet mild and just;—all these may have induced Paul to make this appeal, which Festus readily granted.

**C. The Hearing before Agrippa.** The king comes to Cæsarea, is told by Festus about Paul; requests that he may hear the case and is so favourably affected by Paul's defence that he would have freed him save for the appeal; xxv. 13-xxvi. 32.

*Agrippa the king* (v. 13); known as Agrippa II., son of Agrippa I., great-grandson of Herod the Great, educated at Rome, became a favourite of the Emperor Claudius, who gave him the kingdom of Chalcis and the tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias; afterward Nero bestowed upon him portions of Galilee and Samaria; he died 100 A.D.; a weak, sensual, pleasure-loving man. Bernice was a sister; of shady reputation, twice married, lived long with her brother under suspicious circumstances, was later mistress of both Vespasian and Titus.

Verses 14-27 repeat with slight variations the contents of vv. 2-12, and add that a chief design of Festus was to repeat the hearing in order that he might embody the chief items of the accusation and defence in a letter to the emperor; that he also wished to satisfy the curiosity of Agrippa. There is no evidence that the accusers of Paul were present.

The defence of Paul (xxvi. 2-23) contains little that is not included in the speech before the Jews in Jerusalem, xxii. 2-22, on which see note after xxii. 22; or the defence before Felix, xxiv. 10-21; it has three emphatic features: the orthodoxy of his Pharisaic training and his consequent persecution of Christians; the miracle-vision of his conversion; the explanation of Jewish hostility.

*Thou art expert* (xxvi. 3); no empty compliment; Agrippa was of preponderatingly Jewish blood, descended from the Maccabean priest-kings, and was often in Jerusalem, where he showed his interest in the religion of his ancestors by lavish gifts for the temple and the cultus.

*The twelve tribes* (v. 7) is a formal designation for the whole people.

*I gave my vote against them* (v. 10); rhetorical description.

*It is hard for thee to kick against the goad* (v. 14); the saying is frequent in the Greek literature, not found in Jewish sources; its employment is a sign of the freedom of the composition. The figure is that of a spurred ox thrusting against the goad and thereby increasing the wound and pain.

*To this end have I appeared unto thee*, etc. (vv. 16-18): an explicit command to the Gentile mission, couched in Pauline phraseology (comp. Eph. ii. 2; v. 8; Col. i. 12, 13; 2 Cor. iv. 4, 6).

In ix. 15 this purpose of Paul's conversion is communicated to Ananias in a vision, but not repeated by Ananias to Paul; in xxii. 21, the commission is given by Jesus himself to Paul in a vision while in Jerusalem. Significant is here also the relative prolixity of the Bath-kol or heavenly voice. See note after ix. 19.

*Of Damascus first* and *throughout all the country of Judea* (v. 20); Paul is here universal missionary; for testimony of Paul concerning his relation with Judea, see Gal. i. 22, and note after ix. 31.

*How that* (v. 23) is an unusual and forced rendering of the Greek particle *ἐἴ* which regularly means "if" or "whether," as in margin. We owe to Nestle the suggestion that v. 8, which appears unconnected in the present context, may have originally followed v. 22, and thus v. 23 forms a part of the direct appeal to Agrippa; read *why is it judged incredible with you* *if the Christ must suffer*, etc.

*That Christ must suffer* (v. 23).—That Messiah, the great ruler and king, should be a sufferer, especially that he should suffer as a criminal, was an idea counter to the current expectation. Paul well calls it a "stumbling block," 1 Cor. i. 23.

But the conception of a suffering Messiah was current in Talmudic times; its beginnings are surely as early as the second century, since it appears as a Jewish concession in Justin's *Trypho*, about 150 A.D.; and it may have existed as an infrequent expectation among the Jews in the time of Paul.

*Thy much learning doth turn thee to madness* (v. 24).—The discourse, given here *in nuce*, may have abounded in Rabbinical features, unintelligible to the Roman Festus. The answer of Agrippa to Paul's appeal (v. 28) is not clear. The phrase *ἐν ὀλίγῳ* may mean, (a) "in a brief time," "in summary fashion"; or (b) as expressive of manner: "You have come near"; or (c) ironically: "You seem to think it an easy task"; in view of the character of the king, the last interpretation is preferable.

*This man might have been set at liberty* (v. 32). This is no official deliverance, since Festus was ruler in this territory; but a simple opinion.

**Paul's Journey to Rome.** The route is by sea; near the island of Crete the vessel is caught by a storm, driven westward, wrecked on the island of Malta, where Paul remains three months, then completes the voyage to Rome; xxvii. 1-xxviii. 16.

The "we"-narrative (see Introduction, § 3) is resumed here.

*A centurion named Julius (xxvii. 1)*: the Roman cohort was divided into ten companies over each of which was placed a centurion or captain.

*Adramyttium (v. 2)*; a city not far from Troas in Mysia. On Aristarchus see comment on xix. 29.

At *Sidon (v. 3)*; on the Phœnician coast, north of Cæsarea, there was evidently a Christian church; "*friends*" here denotes fellow-believers.

*The centurion found a ship of Alexandria, sailing for Italy (v. 6)*; Egypt was the granary of Rome; the strong west winds obliged vessels at Alexandria bound for Rome to make a long "leg" northward to the Asia Minor coast; therefore the party boarded such a grain vessel at Myra and *sailed slowly many days (v. 7)* westward over against *Cnidus*, a coast city some 120 miles west, whence the N. W. winds forced them southward to Crete, the largest and southernmost of the islands of the Ægean, under the lee of whose eastern promontory they found shelter; continuing westward they came midway of the island—which is 140 miles long—to *Fair Havens*, a small anchorage; near which the coast bends abruptly to the north. The autumn equinox was now passed; navigation became dangerous. The *Fast (v. 9)* was the Jewish Day of Atonement (Lev. xvi. 29; xxiii. 26-32), which occurred in Sept.-Oct.

The *centurion (v. 11)*, as an imperial officer, was in supreme command; the *more part (v. 12)* advise sailing to a better harbour, *Phœnix*, probably the modern Loutro—though the description here does not exactly correspond,—protected from the sea by the island Aradus.

*Euraquilo (v. 14)*: Euroclydon, "East-north-easter," a typhoon whose course is described by its name.

*Cauda (v. 16)* is about 20 miles south of Phœnix.

The *under-girding (v. 17)* consisted in passing cables



around the ship; ancient vessels were much more frail than modern.

*Syrtis* (v. 17); the shallows and sand-banks of the African coast between Tunis and Tripoli; a dangerous "lee shore" in a northern tempest.

*They lowered the gear*; the phrase is indefinite, either (a) they took in sail, which however would probably have been done at once; or (b) they let down into the sea drag-anchors, implements, anything which would impede the drifting of the vessel. Thus, destitute of compass, mid sunless days and starless nights, the tempest drives them on, unhungry in their terror and despair.

Verses 21-26 bear the appearance of a later insertion into the "we-narrative." (a) They interrupt the connection, since v. 27 is the natural sequence of v. 20; (b) the narrative changes without cause from "we" to "they," and continues thus throughout the section; (c) the address of Paul is given but the result is omitted.

*The sea of Adria* (v. 27); the sea between Greece and Italy

*Four anchors from the stern* (v. 29); this would cause the vessel to lie stern toward the wind, bow toward the land, and thus, should the anchors fail to hold, she would be beached most favourably.

*Having taken nothing* (v. 33) is Oriental hyperbole.

The large number in v. 37 is not incredible.

*They perceived a certain bay with a beach* (v. 39): a bay now called St. Paul's bay lies on the eastern shore of Malta, and James Smith, Ramsay, and Lumby know the very 20th-century mud-bank into which the ship plunged, *where two seas met*; v. 41.

*Melita* (xxviii. 1); the modern Malta, a small island, about 60 miles south of Sicily, then inhabited by Phœnicians or Carthaginians, whence the people are called *barbarians*, v. 2, who however manifested humane feelings.

*A viper fastened on his hand* (v. 3): evidently was believed

by the bystanders to have bitten him. No venomous serpents are now found in Malta (Holtzmann).

*Justice* (v. 4), ἡ Δίκη; a Greek goddess, daughter of Zeus and Themis; avenger of crimes. It is singular that these barbarians should have been acquainted with or worshipped a Greek goddess; this feature may be the narrator's way of setting the incident before Greek readers. See a similar sudden change of opinion in xiv. 11-18.

*Publius* (v. 7) is elsewhere unmentioned; tradition makes him the first bishop of Malta.

*The rest* (v. 9) is the Lucan hyperbole; the narrative resembles Luke iv. 38-40.

*The Twin Brothers* (v. 11); Castor and Pollux, sons of Zeus and Leda, protecting deities of sailors; in astrology the constellation Gemini.

*Syracuse* (v. 12); a city on the east coast of Sicily, founded by Greeks in the 8th century B.C.; under self-government it became great and prosperous, decayed under Roman rule.

*We made a circuit* (v. 13); because of a north wind they tacked far to the east, then west to *Rhegium*, the modern Reggio, an Italian town; thence north to *Puteoli*, a flourishing city on the bay of Naples; thence by land along the famous Appian Way to *The Market of Appius*, 40 miles from Rome; thence some 17 miles to *The Three Taverns*, a hostelry town at the edge of the Pontine marshes. During the stay at Puteoli, the tidings of Paul's approach toward Rome had reached the Christians in that city. Arriving in Rome, Paul was allowed to reside under military custody *in his own hired house*.

Here with v. 16 the "we-narrative" apparently ends.

**Paul and the Roman Jews.** Paul calls together the chief Jews, explains his situation; they desire to hear him; on his preaching some believe, others disbelieve; they are dismissed with the word that their want of faith is a fulfilment of prophecy, and that because of it the Gospel is sent to the Gentiles; xxviii. 17-31.

The speech of Paul (*v.* 17-20) is a summary of the events of chapters xxi.-xxvi., but is written distinctly from the point of view of the author's purpose to represent the Jews as hostile and the Romans as favourable to the Christian cause. Paul cannot have said, after Gal. ii. 12-21 or even Acts xvi. 24, that he had done nothing against *the customs of our fathers*; it contradicts the narrative of Acts xxi. 27-36; xxiii. 23-30 that *v.* 18 represents the Jews as arresting Paul and delivering him at Cæsarea into the hands of the Romans; there is in the hearings, xxiv.-xxvi., no expression of a *desire* to set Paul free; while here Paul's appeal to Cæsar is put to the account of Jewish opposition, in xxv. 9-12 it is attributed to fear of Festus; it is misleading to say that Paul's imprisonment was *because of the hope of Israel*, *v.* 20, since Christians at Jerusalem who had the same hope but kept the Mosaic law dwelt there for years unmolested.

The representation of Paul's relation to Jews and Christians at Rome is equally confused and improbable. That there was years before an important church of mixed Jewish and Gentile elements is proven by Paul's own epistle to them and appears in *v.* 15, which comes from the "we-narrative"; therefore the movement must have been well known to Roman Jews; Paul's name also must have been often on their lips in this world-centre of communication; but here they appear as ignorant of him and only remotely acquainted with his sect; his activity there therefore appears as a missionary movement in a new field in which Paul as usual proffers his Gospel first to the Jews, then on their refusal turns to Gentiles.

Verse 28 appears thus inappositely placed when one remembers that there had been for some years a church predominantly Gentile in their very midst. The section suffers also from a want of unity which has led some scholars to affirm a composite structure; while vv. 23-25<sup>a</sup> indicate

division and partial belief, 25<sup>b</sup>-28 announce a total departure and condemnation with abandonment of Jewish missionary effort. This latter was the condition in Rome at the end of the century.

The citation in vv. 26, 27, is from the call of Isaiah; vi. 9, 10; there the prophet announces the heart-hardening and blindness which his words would cause, here Paul applies the saying to himself.

Verse 29 is not present in the most important MSS., is rightfully omitted.

*And he abode two years in his own hired dwelling (v. 30);* he was certainly assisted by his loving disciples in Philippi (see Phil. iv. 8-18); probably by friends in Rome. Ramsay (*St. Paul*, 310-313) advances the idea that about this time Paul came into the inheritance of a large property which was used to defray his many expenses; it is a surmise, *et præterea nihil*.

*None forbidding him (v. 31);* the book ends with the adverb ἀπολύτως, *unhindered-ly*. It is a trumpet blast of triumph. Despite the machinations of hostile Judaism, unshackled in spirit even if in chains, the greatest of the apostles had fulfilled in his own person the last command of the ascending Messiah, 1. 8; and at this end of the earth preached his word of Jesus and the resurrection, victorious, *unhindered*.



# THE REVELATION OF JOHN.

---

## INTRODUCTION.

1. The book of Revelation is one of the noblest of a class of Jewish and Christian writings which scholarship has designated by the name Apocalypses. Most of these lie between the Maccabean war and the Council of Nicæa; and the conditions of the rise and prevalence of this literature are to be found in Pharisaic Judaism of the scribal era and in those circles of early Christian thought most influenced by Jewish traditions. The decline of prophecy was the rise of apocalypse; already in Is. xxiv.-xxvii., Joel, Zech., its characteristic traits appear. From prophecy it inherits its faith in Israel's future and the profound conviction of the nearness of God's kingdom, whence comes its affinity with Messianic thought and action, and the adoption of many of its characteristic conceptions and important writings by the early Christians. Its main theme like that of prophecy is the establishment of God's kingdom. But prophecy is of the field and market-place and the living voice, ethical, so occupied with present issues that the predictive element is usually ancillary and subordinate; apocalypse is of the pen and of the study, dogmatic, only using the present as a point of departure for the far flight of its vaticination. Both are indeed practical; but prophecy moves with direct step to its ends and operates with symbol and figure within the realm of nature; apocalypse has its goal, but walks midst

obscurities, and employs types and emblems and symbols from the world of the weird, the unreal, the supernatural.

Apocalypse is the child of misery and of faith; and in its woe turns to the unfulfilled utterances of prophecy, that it may utilise them to enhearten the suffering faithful by visions of near triumph for the steadfast. It is thus imitative rather than productive, later writings reflect or absorb or recombine the earlier; authorship becomes, in varying degree, compilation; the structure becomes constantly more complex and artificial. Herein lies the interpretation of its form; the vision is a mere literary device or resource: everywhere there are traces of reflection or research; artificial construction, wealth of Old Testament allusion and quotation, incorporation of written material, utilisation of foreign eschatologies or mythologies clearly reveal careful search and patient calculation. Despite a dogmatic narrowness it could not escape the vigorous eclecticism of the age; Bousset and Gunkel and Moffat have shown how largely the Jewish elements which form the main portion of Revelation are interfused with Persian, Babylonian, and Egyptian conceptions. In this want of spontaneity and originality lies also in part the explanation of the important fact that apocalyptic literature is pseudonymic; the writer is redactor or compiler rather than author, obscure and without influence; he conceals himself behind some great personality of the past; he hopes that the people will listen to what Enoch, Noah, Daniel, Isaiah, Ezra, the Sibyl — great seers all — have spoken.

Apocalypse is especially theodicy; as a product of times of oppression, it will vindicate the divine wisdom and goodness by such interpretation of history past and present and such vision of history to come as will bring peace and patience; they are the birth-pangs of Messiah under which the faithful groan and the nations are smitten; the kingdom will soon dawn. But this kingdom will be the antithesis of

all that now is. The prophetic idea and forecast of perfect earthly conditions is abandoned. The incoming of dualistic conceptions from Parsaism, the growth of the belief in resurrection, the wideness of the new outlook now that Israel was scattered far among the uncounted nations, the hopelessness of the political situation over against the Roman world-dominion, the incurable depravity and idolatry of the Gentiles, the wide defection of no mean part of Israel from the sacred law, the infusion of the more transcendental conceptions of Greek philosophy,—all united to produce and deepen the conviction that the new age would be no culmination of then present forces and causes, but a cosmic revolution, a cataclysm involving heaven and earth and Hades, the work not of man but of God. When evil is at its worst, the kingdom is nearest; for its agencies are not human but supernatural. The new age, *Olam Habba*, will be no perfection of present conditions of mortal existence, but a new life in a new world, which comes into being midst the awful scenes of plague, death, resurrection, judgment, in which angelic and demonic beings are actors and instruments. Therefore apocalypses are by nature dualistic, tend to narrowness of sympathy, call for retribution rather than repentance, though they by their hope and faith served the noble purpose of saving from despair the synagogue and the church under the iron heel of Syria and Rome.

Their main interest for us lies in the fact that their chief eschatological pictures, confused and stormy and ephemeral as they often were, became in large part elements of the *Parousia* or “Second-coming” expectation of the early Christians and passed thence into the eschatology of Christendom, which has thus inherited a doctrine of “the last things” fashioned mainly in the synagogues of scribal Judaism, and unworthy the fundamental ideas of the teaching of Jesus.

2. The contents of the Revelation is stated in the intro-



duction (i. 1) to be "the things which must shortly come to pass": this indefiniteness is removed by a survey of the chapters, which shows that the book is a repertory of apocalyptic eschatology after the usual Jewish and early Christian type: while the Parousia is its central theme, it here receives a rich setting; the last troublous times, the birth-pangs of Messiah, the judgments upon the godless, the resurrection of the dead, a millennial reign of Messiah, a transformation of the world, the establishment of a new heaven and earth,—nearly all the features of the whole series are here. The author will set forth the scenes of "the last things," the transition from *Olam Hazze*, "the age that is," to *Olam Habba*, "the age to come"; in the revelation proper the preliminary judgments of increasing severity (chapters vi.–xi.) are followed by the great events of the end (xii.–xxii. 4); which include the war in heaven and the casting down of Satan; his temporary earthly triumph in the dominion of the beast (political Rome) and his associate (heathen religion); the accompanying persecution of the saints; the coming of Messiah to overthrow Rome, chain the dragon, establish a millennial kingdom for the raised martyrs; a final overthrow of Satan and a general resurrection and judgment follow the millennium; the new and final heaven and earth appear, and the believers enter the heaven-descended Jerusalem. The main articulated portion consists of three series of seven members each (seals, trumpets, bowls) so arranged that the whole contents of the second series, the trumpets, appears as the contents of the seventh member of the first series, the seals; and the contents of the last trumpet is the contents of the whole final series, the bowls. Inserted into this three-fold-seven structure in such a manner as to interrupt the expected sequence is a series of interacts, the most important of which are: (*a*) The Sealing of the Servants, ch. vii.; (*b*) The Prophetic Book and the Chastisement of Jerusalem, x. 1–xi. 13; (*c*) The Woman

and the Dragon, xii. 1-17; (*d*) The Two Beasts from the Sea and Land, xiii. 1-18; (*e*) The Fall of Babylon-Rome, xvii., xviii. These can be easily detached from the main structure of the book; but in them the interest is apparently most intense, and (with the seven epistles, ii., iii.) the historical features most numerous.

The structure of i. 9-iii. 22 is especially elaborate and artificial; there are seven stars, churches, candlesticks, angels, letters; each letter has its stereotyped form and order, and with exceptions perhaps due to textual changes may be analysed into seven parts (see introduction to ch. ii. 1-iii. 22).

The whole book may be easily divided into seven parts, if one exclude prologue (i. 1-8) and epilogue (xxii. 8-21): (1) i. 9-iii. 22; (2) iv.-vii.; (3) viii.-xi.; (4) xi.-xiv.; (5) xv.-xvi.; (6) xvii.-xviii.; (7) xix.-xxii. 7; and some such division may have been in the author's plan.

3. The problem of the literary structure of the book was the last to be examined; antiquity inferred at once the complete unity of Revelation from the name of John in the superscription; the obscurity of its contents and the prevalence of false methods of interpretation prevented the attainment of definite critical results. But the rapid enlargement of the field of apocalyptic literature by the recovery of many lost writings and the more profound examination of its most important volumes, such as Enoch, the Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs, the Ascension of Isaiah, the Apocalypse of Baruch, the Sibylline Oracles, resulted in the well-grounded inference that apocalypses as a class are of composite structure. Many of them are of Jewish origin but of Christian redaction. Scholarship had shown the prevalence of compositeness in other Biblical books; if almost the entire literature of the Old Testament and much of the New showed traces of processes of redaction or compilation, why not also this? Three considerations are urged

in favour of unity: the name of an author, John; the oneness of style; the closely articulated structure. None of these is decisive or even important. The name is no guarantee of entire originality, or indeed of authorship since apocalypses are as a class pseudonymic; the oneness of style finds a sufficient explanation in the common origin from Jews, whether or not Christian, and in redactional changes or translation; closely articulated structure is quite as sure a sign of the redactor as of first-hand spontaneous production.

On the other hand analysis reveals features clearly disharmonic.

The incongruities are sometimes trifling but instructive: *e. g.*, Jerusalem is xi. 2 the *holy city*, but in xi. 8 is *spiritually Sodom and Egypt*; in xviii. 4-8 Rome is to be destroyed by saints rather than by hostile kings as in xvii. 16, 17. Of more importance is the appearance of sections incongruous with their setting, *e. g.*, vii. 1-7 is narrowly Jewish, and is itself composite, while vii. 8-17 is broadly Christian (see special introduction to ch. vii.): in chapter xi. (see special introduction to x. 1-xi. 13) verses 1, 2, show a different spirit from the later verses, in the whole chapter there are difficulties; the whole section x. 1-xi. 13 interrupts the connection of ix. 20, 21, and xi. 14 in a peculiar way: a last judgment is apparently set forth in xiv. 14-20, but another appears in xix. 11-xx. 6, which is manifestly in close relation to ch. xiii.: in xvii., xviii (see special introduction to these chapters), the clear indications of use of source are to be seen.

Chapter xii. is surely an interloper; no original Christian would compose and insert here a vision of the birth of a Messiah who has no earthly history. In chapter xvii. (see special introduction to xvii., xviii) two sources are clearly combined; and the description of the New Jerusalem (xxi. 9-xxii. 5) makes use of a written source.

The two traditions concerning the time of the composition

of the Revelation suggest composite structure; some passages indicate origin in the reign of Nero, others in that of Domitian.

The same conclusion is a natural result from the consideration of the theological divergencies. Here decision is difficult since no man is free from logical inconsistencies, or completely aware of his own paradoxes; and all early Christian eschatological thought is, in the main, modified Jewish conception. But here as in no other book in the New Testament are to be found the extremes of Jewish Messianism and apostolic speculation; the Christology is especially multiplex in form; the Jewish conquering lion (v. 5) was originally no part of the same vision as the Christian slaughtered Lamb (v. 6, 12); the Messiah caught up at birth to God's throne (xii. 5), there to remain until the Parousia (xix. 11), and rule but a millennium (xx. 6), is surely not the Christ of ch. i.-iii.

The one permanent result of the recent study of Revelation is a belief in its composite structure; but the processes of combination have left obscure traces, and the results of analysis are in detail often uncertain; some of the analysts are dangerously near omniscience; the most are willing to concede that some problems are unsolved; science may long occupy itself with the task. Vischer found here a Jewish apocalypse of the reign of Nero, containing the substance of iv. 1-xxii. 6; which was enlarged in the reign of Domitian by a Christian, who prefixed ch. i. -iii., appended xxii. 6-21, and inserted v. 9-14; vii. 9-17; xiv. 1-5, 12, 13; xix. 9, 10; xx. 4-6, and many minor passages, especially those containing the word Lamb.

Some, as Völter, Briggs, and Spitta, regard the structure as more complex, and the redactional additions as small and unimportant. The uniformity of style and regularity of structure forbid a view of the process as simply section and agglutination of written sources, while on the other hand

the exegesis reveals much foreign material, only imperfectly assimilated. For the detail the reader is referred to the introductions to the sections in the commentary which follows.

4. There is in the Revelation no certain indication of the existence or use of other New Testament writings. Some similarities of conception and phrase are due to a likeness of theme or to general Christian thought; the Parousia discourses of the Synoptics (compare, *e. g.*, Mk. xiii. 7, 8, with Rev. vi. 4-8; xiii. 24, 25, with vi. 12-14; Matt. xxvii. 30, with Rev. i. 10; Luke xxi. 24 with Rev. xiii. 10) contain, as does Revelation, current apocalyptic matter; the Pauline conception of the temporary Messianic kingdom in 1 Cor. xv. 22-28 is in some respects similar to that of Rev. xx. 1-6, but there is no evidence of a literary relation between them; the Christology of the seven epistles contains some Pauline features.

A more curious and important fact is disclosed by a comparison of Revelation with the Gospel and first Epistle of John; while it is parted from them as respects its spirituality, eschatology, and general conceptions by the widest chasm which separates any New Testament writings, in certain linguistic features it is most closely allied to them. The divergencies are equally numerous and manifest, so that the hypothesis of a common authorship must be abandoned; the most probable explanation of the phenomena is that there prevailed in the closing decades of the first century and for a generation thereafter a peculiar type of Christian phraseology; its centre was in Asia Minor; other writings as well as the "Johannine" contain traces of it.

5. The author of the book (or of its last elaboration; the composer of i.-iii. and xxii. 6-21) calls himself "John," i. 1, 4, 9; xxi. 2; "a servant" of Christ, i. 1; a "brother and companion" (apparently of those in Asia Minor); asserts for himself the authority and dignity of a prophet, i. 1, 2, 4, and of a bearer of the Spirit; i. 10; xxii. 6. He nowhere

presents himself as apostle, or assumes apostolic authority, speaks of the apostles in an objective way, xxi. 14; he affirms that he received the contents of the book on a "Lord's day" while on "the isle called Patmos" on account of his faith (of banishment there is here no trace), i. 9; he is, apparently, especially familiar with the condition of the churches in Asia Minor at the end of the first century. All these features are susceptible of combination into a simple unity: John was an Asiatic Christian of the end of the century, neither an ecclesiastic nor an apostle; an obscure "servant" who by the possession of the Spirit becomes a prophet of Jehovah, and thereby a peer of the highest among them. But we at once find difficulties. In i. 1 the phrase "the things which must shortly come to pass" plainly puts the whole contents of the book into the future; the author has a vision of what is to come; but these coming events include the Neronian persecution and even the birth of Messiah (see introduction to xii. 1-17). Did the author then wish to present himself as living in the years immediately before the birth of Jesus? This is contradicted by i. 9-11. Then the contents shows that the assertion of vision is clearly a literary device; apocalypses in general are of the parchment-covered table and the lamp, and this apocalypse especially, in its highly elaborate and artificial structure, its rich use of many sources from heathen mythology, Old Testament literature, and contemporary Jewish productions, is farthest from the flash-light vision of some exalted hour; weeks of toil are in its elaboration. Therefore the feature of the "Lord's day" must be also of the literary setting; the isle "called Patmos" is probably the same; and since in apocalypses in general the author by literary device conceals himself under an assumed personality, the name "John" is to be put into the same category. Since apocalypses usually bear the name of some famous person, it is fair to expect the same procedure here; John the Apostle

and John the Elder have been from the earliest time suggested as the real or reputed authors; concerning these see the introduction to the Fourth Gospel. One conclusion has a probability which approaches certainty: the author (or chief redactor) is not to be found among the personal disciples of Jesus, the inner circle of the twelve. One may wisely hesitate to define the area of the impossible, but it is surely in the highest degree unlikely: (*a*) that a person nearly a century old should have been engaged in activities of administration or literary composition; (*b*) that an unlettered Galilean peasant should, in the stress of the Parousia expectation of those earliest years, have turned to literary investigation and Oriental learning; (*c*) that one who had known Jesus in the bodily presence should have passed over all personal recollections, described his master by such defective symbols as a star, a lamb, a lion, or a man-like being with head like wool and feet like brass and two-edged sword protruding from his mouth, pass over all the precious days of sweet intercourse between teacher and pupil and even utterly deny their existence by representing Messiah as caught up to heaven while still a child (xii. 1-7); (*d*) that, above all, one who had sat at the feet of Jesus could put forth a work in which the great teachings of the divine Fatherhood, the universal brotherhood, the spiritual kingdom scarcely appear, but in their place we hear hoarse cries for the day of vengeance, and see the warrior Christ coming to deluge the earth with blood.

6. The first distinct traces of the book appear about the middle of the second century, in the *Trypho* of Justin (lxxxix.), who regards it as the work of John the Apostle. But the writers of the second half of the century are familiar with its pages; the name of John in the introduction (i. 4) and the harmony of its contents with the still prevalent eschatology secured for it a favourable reception and apostolic dignity. Andreas and Irenæus, Theophilus and

Apollonius either cite it or give favourable testimony; Melito of Sardis wrote about 170 A.D. a book concerning it; even Origen holds it to be apostolic (Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv 18, 8; v. 1, 10, 58; vii. 24, 6). But the century also had its opposing voices; Marcion (Tert., *Adv. Marcion*, iv 5) and the Alogi (Epiphanius, *Hær.*, li. 33) rejected it; the assertion of the Alogi that it was written by the heretic Cerinthus is repeated early in the next century by the learned Caius at Rome (Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 28, 2); and Dionysius of Alexandria soon after knows that many before his time agreed with him in rejection of the apostolic authorship. If the decline of Chiliasm now furnishes a dogmatic source of prejudice against it, it may be fairly said that the prevalence of Chiliasm in the preceding century was also a dogmatic source of favourable prepossession. Of more importance is the absence of the book from the two earliest Syriac New Testaments, the Peshito and the Philoxenian; and its reception into the canon of the Orient during the fourth century was largely due to the increasing influence of the Latin Church. The scholars were uncertain; Eusebius and Jerome placed it among the books of the second order, and many of the reformers of the sixteenth century returned to their position; Luther declared it "neither apostolic nor prophetic"; Zwingli regarded it as "not Biblical"; Calvin wrote no commentary on it.

7. The place of (the last) elaboration is clearly indicated by the opening chapters; the seven churches of Asia are before the author's eye; some have conjectured that Ephesus was his home, since it is first in the list. The time of composition can be approximately determined; modern scholarship tends to confirm the assertion of Irenæus that it belongs to the end of Domitian's reign, 93-96 A.D. The number of churches, the traces of decline, the prevalence of heresies, the beginning of a persecution following the Neronic, the attitude toward Rome, the hostility toward emperor-worship,



the interpretation of the mystery of the harlot (see comment on ch. xvii.), the absence of interest in Jerusalem,—are in strong confirmation of the tradition. Features indicating earlier composition are due to sources not entirely assimilated (see xi. 1-3, comment).

One important characteristic of the book indicates composition after the death of Domitian: the call for patience, the intimation that the present persecution has continued and is to continue for a time, the peculiar arrangement of the work in which there are continual delays, and the end, though near, is not yet.

8. The history of the interpretation of Revelation must be omitted.

In Jewish-Christian churches it was without doubt fairly well understood, but in the far circles of Gentile Christianity the conditions for its comprehension were lacking, and with the decay of Chiliasm and the incoming of philosophy there begins a long era, not yet entirely closed, of exegetical "confusion worse confounded." Entirely to be rejected are the theories which find in it the history of the Church or the world from the days of Jesus until the distant "end of the age," and interpret the beast as Mohammed or the papacy or Luther or Napoleon. Equally without warrant is the "futurist interpretation" which regards the visions as entirely unfulfilled, as pertaining to the "last times" of dogmatic theology. Wrong also is the "spiritualistic," which would refine its images and prophecies into delineations of a triumph purely moral or religious. The true interpretation is reached by a combination of the "contemporary-historical," the "poetical," and the "traditional"; the events of the author's time find expression in his images, but the free imagination fashions quaint symbols of war, famine, pestilence, iniquity, and the traditions and myths of the nations are not left unused.

# THE REVELATION OF JOHN.

---

## COMMENTARY

THE title in the oldest manuscripts ran: "Revelation of John." Later additions are: "the apostle," "the evangelist"; in the cursives there is often found: "the theologian," an appellation having its origin in the belief that John the Apostle wrote our Fourth Gospel; in the fourth century he began to be called thus.

I. 1-3. Superscription, describing the character and contents of the book, exalting its significance. It comes from God to men; the media decrease in importance or rank; (1) Christ, (2) an angel, (3) a servant, John.

*The Revelation* (i. 1); the word here includes the whole eschatological cycle, the total prophetic contents of the book, *the things which must shortly come to pass*; its source is the all-determining God; the chief content is the Apocalypse in the narrower sense, the Parousia or near return of Christ from heaven; see 2 Thess. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 7.

*Servants*; the Christian prophets, who were regarded as subjects of a special inspiration. The phrase *he sent*, etc., refers to Christ, who, being in heaven, sent down *his angel*. [Dan. viii. 16.]

The main work presents many angels as revelators; x. 1; xvii. 1; xviii. 1, etc.; this is the same as the one referred to in xxii. 6, where the whole book is conceived as given by a

single mediator. On *John* see Introduction to the Gospel, § 7.

*He that readeth* (v. 3) is the public reader in the Christian assemblies, *they that hear* are the audience. *The time* is that of the fulfilment, *i. e.*, the Parousia with its rewards for those who *hear and keep the things written therein*, therefore they are *blessed*. See xxii. 10 and Phil. iv. 5.

The superscription reads as if prefixed by another hand, but may have been from the author of the sections i. 4-iii. 22, xxii. 6-21.

In verses 4-7 we have the address or dedication, to which v. 8 is loosely appended.

*John to the seven churches* (v. 4).—Since there were more than seven churches in Asia at this time, and some of the oldest such as those at Colossæ and Hierapolis are not included, it is evident that the writer is governed by literary considerations more than by given historical conditions; for him, in his love for the symbolic number seven, this seemed a fitting method in which to arrange the material of his message to his fellow-disciples. This number, sacred in India and in Egypt, where it is found in the greetings of the Amarna tablets, perhaps introduced from Babylonia into Palestine, came often to indicate completion or wholeness; is frequent in late apocalypses.

*Asia* is here the proconsular province, or the western portion of Asia Minor, later called Asia *proconsularis*. it was larger than the district earlier known by the name Asia.

The greeting which follows is peculiar in its order, in that the seven Spirits intervene between God and Christ, therefore appear nearer the divine Eternal One, *which is and which was and which is to come* (a designation not only Biblical, Ex. iii. 14 (LXX.), but Greek, “Zeus was, Zeus is, Zeus will be”). The seven Spirits appear again in iv. 5; v. 6; they play a prominent part in Jewish angelology and early Christian thought; Gunkel traces the idea to Babylonian sources,

where the sun, moon, and five planets are the chief heavenly beings; but it has also a probable source in the Iranian theology, in which the seven Amshashpands aid the good deity Ahura Mazda, in punishing evil and bringing in the final restoration.

The designation of Jesus as *witness, first-born from the dead, and ruler of the kings of the earth* (v. 5) is a combination of Johannine, Pauline, and apocalyptic elements very suggestive and instructive as concerns time of composition, and with the doxology to Christ is in close relation to later New Testament literature; see Romans xvi. 27; 2 Tim. iv. 18; 1 Pet. iv. 11; 2 Pet. iii. 8; Heb. xiii. 21.

*Behold he cometh* (v. 7); the speaker is here God, whose solemn assurance is the theme of the book, and is emphasised by verse 8, where the phrases used are designative of God's eternity and omnipotence,—*Alpha* and *Omega* are the initial and final letters of the Greek alphabet,—and convey a guarantee that there can be no failure.

Verse 7 is in large measure an excerpt from Old Testament passages [Dan. vii. 13; Zech. xii. 10, 12, 14].

#### The Vision introductory to the seven letters; i. 9-20.

*Tribulation* (v. 9): the persecutions in Asia Minor are here considered as the initial steps of the eschatological process; see Matt. xxiv. 9; the *patience* is the ethical condition of participation in the coming *kingdom*.

*Patmos* (v. 9); an island ten miles long, five miles wide, lying in the Ægean, south-west of Ephesus; it was rocky and barren, and was not populous enough to be a centre of missionary activity; while islands were often designated as places of banishment, the tradition that John's presence was due to a conviction and sentence as a Christian appears first about the end of the second century. As the verb is in the imperfect tense, the author does not depict John as writing

the visions in Patmos, and the feature is probably a literary device.

*On the Lord's day (v. 10)*; this is the only New Testament mention of the first day of the week, or Sunday, by the use of this phrase; it is found in the Didache (about 140 A.D.). Deissmann, after Wetzstein and others (*Enc. Bib., sub verbo*), maintains that the context here calls for the reference of the word Lord to God instead of Christ; that therefore the meaning is: I was carried in the spirit into Jehovah's day (of judgment).

*Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, Laodicea (v. 11)* were a group of cities in Asia (on which see v. 4 above); they are here cited in such order that the course from one to the next leads from Ephesus first north along the Ægean coast, then east, then south.

*Seven golden candlesticks (v. 12)*: the *λυχνίας* are properly lamp-stands; are here symbols of the churches (see v. 20), in the midst of which is Christ.

*One like unto a son of man (v. 13)*: the absence of the article shows that we have not here the synoptic technical term for Christ: *the* son of man, while the term of comparison shows that the being referred to is not conceived as a man; the risen Christ is a divine being somewhat resembling a man, is an angel in xiv 14, and probably also in the original passage used, Dan. vii. 13. In the Iranian theology the subordinate deities are often said to be "high-girt." Vayu is called "the high-upgirded, Vayu of the golden girdle."

*His head and his hair (v. 14)*: the difficulty of the relation of the two words may be obviated by the assumption that the word *καὶ* (and) is to be rendered "even" or "particularly," or that "head" means "beard": since the description is a combination from Old Testament and other sources [Dan. vii. 9; x. 6; Enoch xlv. 1] it may well be that the incongruity was not noticed. The whiteness of the hairs is an indication of long life; God especially as the "Ancient

of Days'' is represented as an old man; and angels, as existing from the beginning, might be similarly depicted.

*In his right hand seven stars (v. 16):* for the explanation of the symbolism see v. 20. Christ as Lord over all rules the angels. The representation of Christ is fantastic, combined from incongruous materials; how one may hold seven stars in one hand—apparently empty in v. 17—does not appear: the materials for the feature of *a sharp two-edged sword which proceeded out of his mouth* lie in Ps. cxlix. 6; Is. xi. 4; xlix. 2: the sword symbolises the power of his word, the Logos; see Heb. iv. 12.

*I am the first and the last (v. 17).* See also xxii. 13.

The expression represents Christ as eternal; is adapted from Isaiah; see Is. xli. 4; xlv. 6; xlviii. 12. This author's Christology is of such an advanced type that he does not hesitate to apply to Christ predicates or forms of speech which in the Old Testament are descriptive of Jehovah.

*The keys (v. 18)* are a symbol of power, they were wrested from Death and Hades during the victorious struggle of Christ in the underworld. In Jewish theology the figure is familiar; God alone has the keys of life; food, waters, resurrection.

*The mystery (v. 20)* is, as xvii. 5 and other passages (Matt. xiii. 11; 1 Cor. xiii. 2; Eph. i 9), a truth or fact, usually in symbol, now concealed from many or all, but accessible to men, sometime to be revealed.

*The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches (v. 20).*—These *angels* are probably neither the church messengers nor the churches themselves as truth-bearers; but either (1) the bishops as authorised heads of the churches; an interpretation which has in its favour the two considerations that the other companion symbol, the seven lamp-stands, is of a real and historical existence, *i. e.*, the churches, and that the seer who is in heaven is bidden write to the angels as if they were on earth; or (2) the angels are to be taken as the

guardian angels, sometimes in heaven, sometimes on earth, who watch over churches as well as individuals or nations. This latter interpretation has in its favour that close relation between the stars as living beings and the earthly fortunes of men which is found in the angelology of Babylonians and Persians. Moffat (*Hibbert Journal*, Jan. 1904, p. 348) affirms that in this whole passage i. 16-20, there is a combination of the Zoroastrian belief in fravashis or guardian angels with Babylonian star lore.

The letters to the seven churches, ii. 1-iii. 22.

These seven letters are highly artificial in structure. They are each addressed to the angel of the individual church; they are dictated by Christ himself; the self-designation is usually taken from the description of Christ in i. 8-20; they have, with slight deviations probably due to redactional corruption, a similar seven-membered structure, viz.: (1) Address; (2) Self-designation of Jesus the dictating person; (3) Approval; (4) Blame; (5) Warning; (6) Appeal for attention; (7) Promise. Since the seven churches are only of symbolic or representative selection one must not expect to obtain from the contents of each letter a specific description of local conditions; but in their totality we find an instructive delineation of the situation in Asia Minor at the end of the first century: many Christians grown proud, luxurious, lukewarm, fallen away from the former zeal, incredulous of a near Parousia; many faithful still, loyal amid increasing persecutions, militant against Gnostic heresies within, against Jewish and heathen oppression or opposition without: all in need of the prophetic trumpet-blast that announces the impending doom. In the Christology there is a mingling of the Old Testament phraseology with terms which may be called Pauline and Johannine, so that the delineation loses clear outline; elements of the traditional Messianism, the Jewish apocalypse, and the most recent speculation are here combined.

*Ephesus* (ii. 1): a free Roman city of Asia Minor, six miles from the Ægean, on the left bank of the Cayster; the centre of Roman administration in the province; for three years the scene of Paul's missionary labour; see Acts xix. 1-41.

*These things saith he that holdeth the seven stars* (v. 1). See i. 12, 13, 16.

*Thou*                      *didst try them which call themselves apostles* (v. 2).—The struggle with these false apostles is described as belonging to the recent, not the distant, past; therefore these opponents are not Paul and his co-workers, and the passage is not polemic against Paulinism (as Hilgenfeld argues on the hypothesis of the composition of these letters in the days of Galba); the persons are probably heretical teachers, apostles in the wider sense, of a libertinistic type, and may be identical with the “Nicolaitans” (v. 6), “those that hold to the teaching of Balaam” (v. 14), or “the woman Jezebel” (v. 20); all which, after the manner of apocalypses, refer to the initial forms of Gnosticism which we meet with in Cerinthus or later in the lawless immoralities of the followers of Carpocrates.

*Thy first love* (v. 4): since the phrase cannot mean Christian faith in general, which according to vv. 2, 3, has been preserved, it denotes some special enthusiasm, such as the apostolic fraternal warmth or co-operative practical activity.

*I come to thee* (v. 5), is here not the great Parousia, which was not dependent upon conduct, but some special penal visitation. If the angel of the church here addressed is a real guardian angel the visitation may even take place in one of the heavens.

*Nicolaitans* (v. 6); see comment on v. 2.

*He that hath an ear*, etc. (v. 7): a form of calling special attention to the matter presented; see Mk. iv. 23.

*The spirit* is the spirit of Christ which speaks in the prophets.

The use of the plural: *churches*, shows that the writer has the Christians in Asia Minor as his real readers, though the person directly addressed is the angel of the church.

*The tree of life* is here represented as in the heavenly Paradise, the third heaven, which is therefore called God's. See 2 Cor. xii. 4. The Paradise of Lk. xxiii. 43 is the temporary abode of the righteous in the underworld. These



two conceptions of the heavenly and the underworld Paradise are deviations from the Babylonian idea of an earthly Paradise (incorporated into Genesis ii. 8-iii. 24, which contained, as did the Babylonian, a tree whose fruit conferred immortality upon the eater). So in the Iranian theology there was a sacred tree, Gaokerena, by drinking the juice or sap from which on the day of resurrection men would become immortal.

*Smyrna* (v. 8); a city north of Ephesus, very ancient, rebuilt during the Macedonian rule; populous in this period; its church had as its bishop in the opening years of the second century Polycarp the martyr who is supposed by Nicolas de Lyra to be the angel here addressed.

On the *first and last* see i. 17.

*Which say they are Jews and they are not* (v. 9).—The use of the phrase *synagogue of Satan* in the following clause indicates that the persons here denounced were not Judaizing heretics nor Pauline extremists, but veritable Jews, who were numerous and hostile in these cities. The *Apostolic Constitutions* even denies the name of Jews to those who condemned Jesus.

*The devil* (v. 10) uses these hostile Jews as means of casting Christians into prison; the *ten days* is from Dan. i. 12.

The *crown of life* was the garland of fadeless flowers given to victors; *στέφανος* is often so used. Here it is the special glory bestowed upon martyrs; see 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8.

*The second death* (v. 11) is interpreted (xx. 14, 15) as the *lake of fire*; in Rabbinic representation, which the author here follows, it was the consignment to Gehinnom which awaits the unrighteous in the universal judgment at the "end of the age."

*Pergamum* (v. 12); a city north of Smyrna, of the province Mysia, ten miles from the Ægean; populous since Alexander, cultured, a centre of heathen worship, especially of the emperor cult, therefore there is *Satan's throne*.

*Antipas* (v. 13) is probably a historical personage; according to an early tradition was a martyr in Pergamum in the reign of Domitian; his day in the Roman calendar is April 11th.

*The teaching of Balaam* (v. 14) is described as commendatory of *eating things sacrificed to idols*, and of *fornication*. The fornication, *i. e.*, idol worship, of the Israelites in Numb. xxv. 1, 2, is by Jewish writers, such as Josephus and Philo, therefore probably also in popular tradition, attributed to Balaam. But the persons here mentioned must be inside the Church, else no blame; the eating things sacrificed to idols may be taken literally and fornication here denote too free intercourse, perhaps marriage, with unbelievers; and both be practised by some ultra-Pauline disciples in the churches of Asia Minor. Since Balaam in Hebrew means "devourer of people" and Nicolaus in Greek "conqueror of people," the similarity gave occasion to the author to give his warning the apocalyptic form.

*I come* (v. 16); see comment on ii. 5.

*The hidden manna* (v. 17): the reference may be to the pot of manna hidden or laid away in the earthly or in the heavenly tabernacle, Ex. xvi. 34; Heb. ix. 4; but it is more natural to connect the phrase with the popular Jewish idea that in the Messianic times the faithful would enjoy that "ambrosial nourishment," "food of angels," "spiritual bread," 1 Cor. x. 3; now, as food of angelic beings, concealed from men.

*A white stone*: according to *soma* 8 (so Wetzstein) precious stones rained from heaven along with the manna. This stone may be conceived either as a white stone of judicial acquittal or a means of admission to the Messianic feast or an amulet with a magic formula (so Bousset). The phrase *new name* or "secret name" is often found in apocalyptic descriptions.

*Thyatira* (v. 18); north-east of Smyrna; famous for its

weaving and dyeing (Acts xvi. 14) and its Apollo cult; later a famous centre of Montanism. For the characterisation of Christ, see i. 14, 15.

*The woman Jezebel* (v. 20); in the Old Testament she is the famous Phœnician princess, wife of Ahab king of Israel, and enemy of Jehovah's prophets; Elijah's foe, 1 Kings xvi. 31, etc.; here a symbol of the false, ultra-Pauline, teachers; compare with v. 14. Some historical personage *may* have given occasion for the allusion; there were prophetesses of Montanism here later.

*The deep things* (v. 24) is a Gnostic phrase; the author characterises it by adding the words *of Satan*; it is another phase of heresy, connected like Marcion's with Pauline ideas.

*Authority over the nations* (v. 26): legal jurisdiction at the Parousia judgment; see 1 Cor. vi. 3.

*Sardis* (iii. 1); an ancient city on the river Pactolus, some seventy miles north-east of Ephesus; the residence of Lydian kings and later of Persian satraps; damaged by an earthquake during the reign of Tiberius; now a ruin.

*The seven Spirits* and the *seven stars*: see comment on i. 4, 16.

*I will come as a thief* (v. 3): see comment on ii. 5; but here is insertion of a Parousia feature; see Matt. xxiv. 43; 1 Thess. v. 2.

*White garments* (v. 5) are a symbol of victory. *The book of life* is, as in the Old Testament (Is. iv. 3; Ex. xxxii. 32; Ps. cxxxix. 16), a book kept by God in which were registered persons or things living or existing or destined to live or exist; in the apocalyptic circle of ideas the conception was amplified; the book was represented as containing a list of the friends of God, or of the deeds of all men and thus furnishing a basis for judgment; Dan. xii. 1; often in Enoch and Book of Jubilees; Lk. x. 20; Phil. iv. 3; Rev. v. 1; xiii. 8; xvii. 8; xx. 12, 15; xxi. 27.

*I will confess his name, i. e.*, I will declare him my disciple at the Messianic judgment; see Matt. x. 32; Lk. xii. 8.

*Philadelphia* (v. 7); an unimportant city, south-east of Sardis. The self-characterisation of Christ is from i. 18; Is. xxii. 22, which refers to Eliakim, is used as a Messianic prophecy.

*A door opened* (v. 8) is either the open door to future Messianic glory or as in Pauline usage (1 Cor. xvi. 9; 2 Cor. ii. 12) some promising missionary opportunity; the former is preferable.

*Synagogue of Satan* (v. 9); see comment on ii. 9. Many Jews dwelt in the city, and controversies with them are mentioned in the epistle of Ignatius to the Philadelphians, written a few years later.

*The hour of trial* (v. 10); the world-wide calamities which closely precede the Parousia; as Matt. xxiv. 6-22; 2 Tim. iii. 1-7; from which, as themselves already tested, believers are to be excepted.

*The new Jerusalem* (v. 12): see comment on xxi. 1-3; as to its nature and descent from God, Gal. iv. 26; Heb. xi. 10; xii. 22; xiii. 14: on the *new name*, see comment on ii. 17.

*Laodicea* (v. 14): a city nearly east of Ephesus on the borders of Phrygia. Many Jews were induced to settle there by Antiochus the Great; therefore at this time the Jewish population was numerous and prominent in finance.

The self-characterisation of Christ is from i. 4-6.

*The beginning of the creation* (v. 14): the word "beginning" denotes the active cause, the fundamental principle ("Urgrund"; Bousset); it is here used in its causal, not temporal, signification.

Laodicea is the type of the indifferent self-satisfied church, delineated in vv. 15-19.

*I stand at the door and knock* (v. 20): a New Testament eschatological feature; see Mk. xiii. 34, 35; Matt. xxiv. 33; xxv. 1-13. Messianic salvation is often depicted as a feast;

one must knock for admission; here Messiah is without, unseen but near.

The Vision of the Seven Seals; iv. 1-vii. 1. The vision is loosely joined to chapters i.-iii. by the phrase *after these things*. It may be fairly assumed to have once existed as a separate apocalypse, but is now woven into the general structure of the book by the elaboration of the author and so stands in literary relation to both the preceding and following chapters.

Chapter iv. is introductory; in the contents of the seals there is climax; the miseries and woes increase until the whole earth is involved. The author has so transformed the vision that the contents of the seventh seal embraces the events of the remainder of the present book; see Introduction, § 2. In the general structure the events symbolised or represented by the six seals are the evil times of the last days which precede the coming of the Son of Man.

*After these things I saw* (iv. 1); the formula which introduces new material or important elements; vii. 1; xv. 5; xviii. 1.

*A door opened in heaven*: the firmament was conceived as a dome with openings for ingress and egress; Mk. iii. 16; Acts x. 11.

*The first voice* refers to i. 10, is there the voice of the heavenly Christ; if here the same it is of Christ conceived as lamb or lion, v. 5-14.

*I was in the Spirit* (v. 2): the phrase is probably part of an original introduction to this section, and was retained despite its incongruity with i. 10. Verse 1 is a connecting link between the two visions (i.-iii. and iv.-vii.), but the joining is incomplete.

The vision of God in vv. 2, 3, is mainly from Old Testament sources; Ezek. i. 26, 28; x. 1; Is. vi. 1; Dan. vii. 9. The precious stones may be symbolic of divine attributes.

*Four and twenty elders* (v. 4): the phrase is an apocalyptic enigma.

In the little apocalypse, Is. xxiv.-xxvii., written late

(320-300 B.C., Cheyne; 150-105, Duhm), the elders of God are mentioned, xxiv. 23; but in the context the author speaks of Zion and Jerusalem. These elders however are clearly heavenly beings. The usual interpretation that here they are ideal representatives of the Jewish and Christian churches is improbable; the Christian feeling against Judaism was very strong; and these beings appear as eternal companions or servants of Jehovah; their function is perpetual adoration; therefore they are to be regarded as angelic beings. In Col. i. 16 "thrones" appear as the first and highest of a series of heavenly existences. In *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, written before 70 A.D. and "highly syncretistic" according to Charles ("Apoc. Literature," in *Enc. Bib.*) occurs this passage: "And they brought before my face the elders and the rulers of the orders of the stars." If this indicates that the rulers of the stars were called "elders" or "ancients" (so Bousset), there is little doubt that we have here a feature of Oriental astrology; the Babylonians had twenty-four star-divinities; such beings would dwell in the highest heavens.

The *seven lamps* which are the *seven Spirits* (v. 5) are also an Oriental feature (see comment on i. 4); and while the description of the *four living creatures* (vv. 6-9) comes in considerable measure directly from the Old Testament (see Ezek. i., Is. vi.), there is much here common to Semitic mythology. See articles "Cherub" in *Enc. Bib.*, and "Cherubim" in *Hastings' D. B.* The *glassy sea* (v. 6) is that which divides the first or upper from the second heaven. To one looking at and through it from below it would seem to be *before the throne*. Thus from below the *four living beings* whose function it is, as in Ezekiel, to support the throne would appear to the upward gazer both *in the midst of the throne* and *round about the throne*. The word *calf* in v. 7 is better rendered "ox"; these four beings may in the writer's thought have symbolised some attributes of Deity; the original function of the cherub was that of guarding a deity;

this has been discarded under the influence of monotheism for that of worship, in which the elders or ancients join. It is worthy of notice that in this lofty description (*vv.* 8-11) God alone is presented as the object of worship.

*A book* (v. 1); the book is here the roll of destiny, abounding in events; therefore contrary to usage written without as well as within (Ezek. ii. 9, 10; Is. xxix. 11).

*The Lion of the tribe of Judah* (v. 5); a designation of Messiah from Gen. xlix. 9; the *root of David* is from Is. xi. 1, 10.

*A lamb* (v. 6); this is in the book the most frequent symbol of Christ; a Johannine feature, see John i. 29; the lamb is shown to be *slain* by the cut in the throat (so in ancient and mediæval art), but made non-natural by the seven horns and seven eyes. The whole representation is in confusion, as often in apocalypses; Messiah is lion, root, seven-horned and seven-eyed lamb, yet able to take a book and open its seals. One suspects that some of this is due to working over older pictures, the redactor inserting incongruous elements, so that the whole representation is grotesque.

*Horns and eyes* are symbols of might and knowledge; *seven* is of completion; the risen Messiah has all power and knowledge, Matt. xxviii. 18; concerning *seven spirits* see comment on i. 10.

The ideas of *vv.* 9, 10, are to be found in i. 5, 6.

The phrase *they reign* (v. 10) is to be taken as future, or one may read βασιλεύσουσιν with Cod. Sin.; the actual rule of believers follows later, xx. 4.

In *vv.* 10-12 the song of devotion widens, the angels join; then in v. 13 the whole universe takes up the strain, which in 12 is praise of the Lamb, in 13 to both God and the Lamb.

The Christian redaction is discernible, but the original form not recoverable; the elders fall down in v. 8, without opportunity to rise in vv. 9-13; they fall again in v. 14. Spitta finds interpolation in v. 8.

The four mystic horses and their riders; vi. 1-8. The material closely resembles Zech. 1. 8; vi. 2-8 is probably adapted therefrom. The four horses are by some regarded as significative of historical events or persons; either (a) the first four emperors: Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius; or (b) Roman victories, wars, famines, pestilences in the years 50-70 A.D.; preferable is the opinion that they are general symbols of the "travail-pains" which as features of the last times indicate the near Messiah (Matt. xxiv., 6-8; Lk. xxi., 10, 11).

*A white horse, and he that sat thereon had a bow (vi. 2).*—The person is not Messiah, who in this vision appears as a lamb; the description contains no special features of Rome; if one were to find some historical reality more probability attaches to the suggestion of Bousset that we have here a symbol of the Parthian empire or its king Vologoses, who invaded Syria in 61-2 A.D., and captured a Roman army; more probably this is a symbol of conquest or victory as indicated by the whiteness of the horse.

The next symbol (*v. 4*) is war; the contents of the third (*v. 5*) indicate famine. The *measure* (*v. 6*) was about 1½ pints, the *penny* about seventeen cents; the usual grain price is increased about twenty-fold. Oil and wine may be in plenty during a food famine.

*Behold, a pale horse (v. 8):* the symbolism indicates pestilence. *Hades* is the servant of Death; gathers in his master's victims.

*Underneath the altar (v. 9).*—No altar had been mentioned in this vision; either the presence of the article indicates that some original feature has been omitted, or there is a presupposition that readers knew of a heavenly altar of which that in Jerusalem might be a copy (Heb. viii. 5; ix. 11, 12).

The *souls* (*ψυχαι*), since their seat is in the blood, are underneath the altar, where the flowing blood ran. The martyrs therefore are Christians whose souls are in heaven, not in Hades with the multitudes of the dead; they may be



the victims of the Neronic persecution, long waiting for vengeance on Rome (v. 10); but given *white robes* (v. 11) as symbols of victory, and besought to rest *a little season* until the death of fellow-martyrs (in Asia Minor?): the writer sees no further persecution; the end cometh swiftly.

The features of vv. 9-11 are late Jewish; in the rigid predestinarianism and the impatience of the righteous in waiting for retribution there are distinct parallels from 4 Ezra iv. 35, 41; Enoch ix. 1-3; xxii. 5; xlvi. 1.

The description of the sixth seal is almost entirely from the Old Testament and current apocalyptic sources, and only its significance as a whole is in controversy. Of little probability is the contention of Farrar and others that only political commotions are here symbolised, though such may be included; the earthquake is no historical event; *σεισμός* is here a shaking of the then known universe, thus includes clearly the sun, moon, stars, and firmament; the effects are described from the point of view of the geocentric cosmography. The *princes* of v. 15 may be Parthian rulers, as Mommsen suggests, and the chief captains Roman officers; but since the seals contain woes in climactic order it is better to regard all these features as general rather than local.

*The great day of their wrath* (v. 17) is better rendered *his* (i. e., God's) *wrath*; the readings vary, but nowhere else in the book is there any mention of wrath (*ὀργή* or *θύμος*) of Christ; the phrase in the preceding verse "*and from the wrath of the Lamb*" is also insertion by some Christian hand, possibly the redactor's. The day is the well-known Old Testament and New Testament day of Jehovah's judgment, the "last day" of the pre-Messianic age; or an initial event in Messiah's reign: the representation varies.

(Is. ii. 10, 19, 21; 1. 3; Joel i. 18; ii. 1, 2, 10, 11, 15; Ps. ii. 2; xlvi. 8; Zeph. i. 7 ff., ii. 3; Mal. iii. 1.)

**Interact:** The Sealing of the Servants; ch. vii. The contents of the sixth seal end with vi. 17; the seventh seal is opened with viii.

1. This chapter is therefore an interact, of which the book contains a number. (See Introduction, § 2.) It is easily divisible into two parts; (a) 1-8; (b) 9-17. The scene of the first section is apparently the earth, of the second, heaven; the 144,000 are sealed to preserve them from harm in *coming* terrors and miseries; the uncounted multitudes of the second section come forth from the *past* woes of the *great tribulation*; in the one we have Jewish elect, in the other Christian martyrs; in the one the sheltered living, to whom calamity is not to come, in the other the blessed and glorified dead. The contrast and incompatibility are so striking that many critics find themselves forced to some hypothesis of composite origin; Vischer and Pfeiderer found vv. 9-17 to be a Christian interpolation into a Jewish context; Bousset would make unitary composition possible by regarding vv. 9-17 as proleptic, the anticipatory insertion of experiences which belong chronologically in late chapters of the book. The first section, vv. 1-8, is also composite; the two features of the angels of the winds and the 144,000 sealed servants appear to be conjoined fragments.

*Four angels (vii. 1):* the angels of the winds (see Enoch lx. 12), restraining the hurricanes of the last times.

*The seal of the living God (v. 2).*—The seal is here a signet ring; generals seal their soldiers, masters their servants; the followers of the beast (xiii. 16; xiv. 9) are sealed by him.

*An hundred and forty and four thousand, sealed out of every tribe of the children of Israel (v. 4).*—In the source used this number may have designated the totality of the Jews preserved; in the present book it apparently indicates the Jewish element of the Church; the Gentile factor is in vv. 9-17. There is no sufficient reason for regarding these as symbolic of the whole Church, unless we consider vv. 9-17 as a disturbing interpolation. The later Judaism, as the earlier, loved to depict the Messianic age as containing a rehabilitation of the traditional tribal organisation of the Mosaic time. The tribe of Dan is here omitted, perhaps because in Jewish apocalypse Antichrist comes forth from that tribe. Joseph appears in place of Ephraim. The sealing is not Christian baptism, it is a means whereby the true Israel may

be known and preserved, as by the blood-marked lintel when Israel's first-born were saved from death.

*A great multitude* (v. 9): these are Christian martyrs, caught up to God's throne at death, instead of abiding in Sheol with the masses of the dead,—such is also Paul's expectation in case of martyrdom, Phil. i. 23,—and thus preserved from the final calamities. The situation, unless proleptic, presupposes severe persecutions in the Roman empire. The multitude is not the 144,000 of the section vv. 1-8, since the same persons cannot be both accurately numbered and countless; they are not the whole Gentile Christian world since they are caught up to heaven before the worst woes and the Parousia; they are the martyrs of the author's time.

*In the blood of the Lamb* (v. 14): the word "in" here denotes the cause, see xii. 11; the blood is not the material in which the robes were washed, but is a symbol of the spiritual power by means of which they were cleansed; symbol and reality are confused.

The beautiful hymn (vv. 14-17) is woven from Old Testament material (Is. vi. 1; Ps. xlvii. 8; Is. xlix. 10; xxv. 8; Ps. cxxi. 6; xxxiii. 1-3; xxxi. 16; Jer. ii. 13; Ezek. xxiv. 33).

**The Vision of the Seven Trumpets; viii. 1-xi. 19.** This vision or group is so related to the preceding seals that all its contents is also the contents of the seventh seal, developed into a new group of seven. Presumably the two groups were of separate origin, and it is impossible to determine what were the contents of the original seventh seal which was set aside for this new group; but since at the close of the sixth *the great day of wrath* was at hand (vi. 17) it may fairly be inferred that the seventh contained a final scene of judgment and Messiah's appearing. This vision contains, like the preceding, an interact, x. 1-xi. 13; when this is excised, there remains the same seven-fold division with its section into 4 + 3. The calamities are not earth-born, nor do they run their course in the usual order of nature: they originate in heaven or Hades; have

supernatural, artificially constructed features, many of which resemble the plagues in Egypt at the Exodus.

The contents of the last trumpet are not given since the last of the series contains the next or following group, as before.

*A silence (viii. 1)*; the breathless oppressive silence before the storm bursts, more potent because of its long continuance: *the space of half an hour*.

*The seven angels (v. 2)* are the archangels; see comment on i. 4.

*Trumpets* announce the Parousia and last judgments, 1 Cor. xv. 52; 1 Thess. iv. 16.

The episode of vv. 3-5 is an angelic incense-offering to make potent, and hasten the fulfilment of, the prayers of the saints or martyrs for speedy avengement; see v. 10, 11. That which is incense in heaven is judgment upon earth; the stillness breaks, thunders resound, the earth is shaken.

The four plagues of the first group, vv. 7-12, come from heaven and smite successively the third of the dry land, the sea, the inland waters, the firmamental luminaries. The destruction is partial, therefore the use of the word *third*.

The *wormwood* (v. 11) is here a supernatural bitter poison, not the harmless natural herb (Ex. vii. 1, 9 ff.; ix. 2-4; Is. xiv. 12; Jer. xxiii. 15; Ezek. xxxviii. 22; Joel ii. 30).

These four plagues are now to be succeeded by the second group of three, which are so much more fearful as to be designated *woes* (v. 13) and be announced by a *flying eagle*.

*A star* and to him was given the key, etc. (ix. 1): as to stars conceived as rational beings see comment on i. 4, 20. Sometimes they appear on earth as men, beasts, monsters; Enoch lxxxvi; lxxxviii.

*The abyss* is here the abode of the great dragon; the waste underworld region where dwelt also the many evil demons: a modification of the Babylonian idea.

The *pit* is probably that part of the abyss in which was situated the lake of fire. Satan, flung down from heaven in

the beginning of Messiah's *heavenly* triumph, xii. 7-9, is at the day of Messiah's *earthly* triumph, xx. 1-3, cast into this pit for a thousand years. The opening leading to it was sometimes thought to be under the temple at Jerusalem, or in the valley of Hinnom.

*The locusts* (v. 3) are demonic existences; they torment the unsealed *five months*, the usual length of plague by locusts.

The *angel of the abyss*                      *Abaddon*                      *Apollyon* (v. 11) is not the angel of v. 1; not the Satan of xi. 9, who is yet in heaven; he is the "*destroyer*," the leader of the destroying hosts, and may appear as Sheol or Hades or the lake of fire personified.

Worthy of mention is the surmise of Grotius that Apollyon may be here a fling at the Greek god Apollo, one of whose favourite animals was the cicada. (Ex. x. 12; xix. 18; Ezek. ix. 4; Job. iii. 21; Joel i. 6; ii. 4, 5, 10.)

The second woe, the sixth trumpet, vv. 13-21, is more congruous with the first group, viii. 6-13, since a third part of men are killed by the smoke, the fire and brimstone from the mouths of the two hundred million snorting horse-like animals with lion heads. It is possible to read (with Spitta) in verses 14 and 15 "hosts" instead of "angels," but the representation is equally unreal. There is no clear connection between the angels and the horsemen: they appear as parts of originally distinct fragments. The material is probably from some source used in the Syrian *Apoc. Ezra*, where we read: "And a voice was heard, 'There shall be loosed four kings who are bound at the great river Euphrates, who will destroy the third part of men'"; which source was probably also used in Enoch. There may be indistinct reference to some Parthian incursion; but the representation transcends the historical. In its original setting this stupendous calamity, the death of one third of the race, was the last woe before the end; in the present complex of Revelation it is more remote from the final cataclysm.

**Interact:** The vision of the prophetic Book and the chastisement of Jerusalem; x. i-xi. 13.

After the sixth trumpet we have an interact, as was the case

after the sixth seal in the preceding group. As the first was composed of two parts only loosely connected, so in the second, chapter x., which contains the vision of the Book, was originally distinct from the vision of the chastisement of Jerusalem in chapter xi.

Both parts are now so combined that the vision of the Book is an introduction to the chastisement of Jerusalem. The size of the introduction and its final feature in v. 11, a command to extensive prophecy, led Weyland and Spitta to the conclusion that with x. 1 a new source begins. The explanation of the importance lies in the structure of the Apocalypse itself. The seventh seal contained, as we saw in the Introduction, § 2, the whole remaining contents; the seventh trumpet is to contain what yet remains, which is to be presented in the form of a new series of seven. Therefore this interact is of the nature of an introduction to the whole remainder of the book and may well be furnished with an elaborate preface. The vision xi. 1-13 is peculiar both in style and contents; its many obscurities, inexplicable features, and paradoxes led Vischer to the conclusion that it was of Jewish origin, with Christian interpolations.

The material is indeed Jewish, and Bousset has shown that it is probably derived from a wide and elaborate tradition; but its present author may have been a Christian. The representation in xi. 2 of the temple as apparently to be untouched by the coming visitations has led some to the inference that the whole section was composed before 70 A.D. But the evidence is ambiguous; the fragment may be one untouched by revision or redaction, like Matt. xxiv. 29; the interact as we have it is surely later than the Jewish war of 66-70 A.D.

*Another strong angel (x. 1):* see v. 2; the word *strong* may come from a separate source. The seer is now on earth, not as in viii. 2-ix. 21, in heaven.

*The seven thunders (v. 3)* are mentioned as if previously presented, or as well known; it has been suggested that the reference is to the seven-fold use of the phrase "voice of the Lord" in Ps. xxix. 3-9; the word *uttered* is the translation of λαλέω, which usually denotes intelligible speech.

*Seal up (v. 4)* is to carefully preserve in memory, but not to communicate. Here is probably indicated the suppression

of a septet; the contents of the seven thunders lay before the author in some undesirable form or substance.

The word *χρόνος* in v. 6 is with the margin to be rendered *delay*; therefore the suppression of the contents of the thunders in v. 4.

*The mystery of God* (v. 7), finished with the seventh trumpet, may be specifically the overthrow of Satan in ch. xii. (so Bousset); but is preferably the whole remaining contents conceived as included in the seventh trumpet.

For explanation of the word *mystery*, see comment on i. 20.

*Take it and eat it up* (v. 9). The symbolism of this section is adapted from the call of Ezekiel to the prophetic office, Ezek. ii. 8-iii. 11; where the eating the written roll indicates a faithful reception of God's unwelcome or unpleasant truth. Here the seer devours with eagerness the divine decrees; which as divine are sweet to the mouth of receptive faith, but as earthly visitations are bitter to digestive reflection.

*They say* (v. 11); the angel of vv. 1, 5, 9, and the voice of vv. 4, 8. *Again* may refer to the book of v. 1 ff.

*Rise* (xi. 1): *ἐγείραι* is simply a "formula for arousing," up! come on!

The command to *measure* indicates the purpose of preservation; *the altar* is the altar of burnt offering, therefore the court of the priests was included.

*The court without the temple* (v. 2) was the court of the Gentiles. The narrow nationalism of the original Jewish source has been preserved here, as also the expectation that the temple would not be destroyed; a procedure inexplicable in redaction by a Christian, since the prophecy of the temple's destruction is one of the most prominent features of the Parousia-discourse of Jesus (Mk. xiii. 2 and parallels).

*Forty and two months* (v. 2) is  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years, one half the sacred year week of Dan. vii. 25; viii. 12-14; xii. 7. The number is a favourite apocalyptic one; see xii. 6, 14; xiii. 5; it denotes an indefinite period of some near events not long continued,

and symbolises incompleteness. The Parousia-discourse in Luke knows also an indefinite period of the treading Jerusalem under foot by the Gentiles; Lk. xxi. 24.

*My two witnesses (v. 3)*: one is Elijah; the representation of the other combines features from the Old Testament accounts of Enoch and Moses. The explanation may be found in the hypothesis that the Jewish source used by the Christian author described Enoch, that he substituted some features from the tradition as to Moses, and left some undisturbed. These two witnesses, caught up to heaven, now return to preach repentance, are therefore *clothed in sack-cloth 1260 days*, the 42 months of v. 2. In the New Testament Elijah appears often as an expected personage of the last days; in the Transfiguration narrative both Moses and Elijah appear. Their prominence is indicated by the application to them of Zech. iv. 3, 11-14; where Zerubbabel and Joshua are called two olive trees. Further descriptions of them in v. 6 have basis in 1 Kings xvii. 1; Ex. vii. 19.

*The beast that cometh out of the abyss (v. 7)*: the reference is to some well-known mythological being. In xiii. and xvii. the same being is identified with a Roman emperor or the city of Rome itself; but since the Oriental conception of the abyss and its ruler is very mutable, appearing in very varied forms, identified with many historical or ideal personages, it is more conformable to the context to regard the beast here as Antichrist (Bousset).

*Sodom (v. 8)* is Jerusalem; see Is. i. 10; Jer. xxiii. 14; an interpretation confirmed by the following phrase: *where also their Lord was crucified*; which may be a very early insertion.

*Three days and a half (v. 9)*: half an apocalyptic week, as  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years form one half a year week in vv. 2, 3. The gathered nations—as in Joel iii. 2—inflict upon the dead bodies of the two witnesses a special indignity in leaving them unburied; Ps. lxxix. 3.

*They that dwell on the earth (v. 10)* may be in antithesis to



those that worship in the temple, v. 1; or the word earth may be used in the narrow sense of "land" or "region."

The resurrection and ascension of the two witnesses Moses and Elijah (vv. 11, 12) are not found in the general tradition of Antichrist.

*A great earthquake* (v. 13): such phenomena are made to occur at important events in human affairs; so at the resurrection of Jesus, Matt. xxviii. 2.

*Seven thousand* is a round number; the population of Jerusalem before the war of 66-70 A.D. was about 100,000.

This section on the chastisement of Jerusalem (xi. 1-13) is composite. Verses 1-2 are separable from the following, and are in a form fixed before 70 A.D.; the remainder of the chapter is the late working over of material which is Jewish and pre-Christian in origin: apocalyptic matter concerning Antichrist used in varying degrees in 2 Thess. and the Parousia-discourse of the Synoptics (Mk. xiii. and parallels), in contemporary Jewish apocalyptic literature, in more fixed and developed forms among Christians since the days of Irenæus. (See "Antichrist" by Bousset in *Enc. Bib.*) In this tradition Anti-Messiah appears in Jerusalem, leads the people astray, summons an immense army of heathen, rules 3½ years, when two witnesses—usually represented as Enoch and Elijah—expose him, lead many back to the true faith, but are by him put to death, and the faithful flee into the desert. The feature of the two witnesses is here taken from its Jewish setting; a few Christian touches are inserted, see 8<sup>b</sup> and 11; this is incorporated into the delineation of Jerusalem's chastisement.

The order of trumpets is now resumed; xi. 14 can be regarded as immediately following ix. 21; but as the seventh seal has no definite content, appears rather to include all that is to follow, so here in v. 15 the significance of the seventh trumpet is summed up in the anticipative announcement: *the kingdom of the world is become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ*. This appears clearly from the facts that in the preceding episode the nations remain hostile and that the chapters to follow delineate their overthrow. The seer

is now in heaven again as in ch. viii.-ix. The word *Christ* in v. 15 does not of necessity refer to the Christian Messiah; but the singular number in the following clause indicates that the words *and of his Christ* are an addition. Verses 16-18 are connected with iv. 4 ff.; are a hymn of praise that the hour of retribution is come.

*The temple of God that is in heaven* (v. 19). In the fourth heaven, named Zebul, were the heavenly Jerusalem, the temple, the altar, and Michael who daily sacrifices there (Beresch. Rab. vi.; Bam. Rab. xvii). *The ark of his covenant*, which according to earlier Jewish tradition was hidden by Jeremiah at the capture of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., is here conceived as having been caught up to heaven by angels; the disclosure of the temple and ark is proof of the nearness of the Messianic times.

The woman and the dragon; xii. 1-17.

The contents of this important section may be summarised thus: A mystic woman, wearing the sun as a garment, pregnant, is delivered of a man child. A dragon waits to devour it, but the boy is caught up at once to God's throne. War in heaven results; Michael and his angelic hosts defeat the dragon and his forces, and cast them down into the earth where they persecute the mother, who flees into the wilderness from the dragon and the river which he pours forth from his mouth. The earth swallows the water; the woman is saved; the dragon turns to wage war with the remainder of her seed.

*A great sign* (xii. 1): the sign is apparently the sign of Messiah, the Son of man in Matt. xxiv. 30. *In heaven* may possibly mean "on the sky," and the seer be gazing upward from earth; but the initiative is in heaven; the sun, moon, and stars are in the second heaven, and the conflict is there; the dragon is represented as previously resident there, vv. 8, 10.

*A woman* (originally a mythological personage, the sun-mother) is here the heavenly archetype of Israel, brings

forth Messiah in heaven, her dwelling-place; many think of the theocracy; Catholic exegesis finds here the Virgin Mary.

*A great red dragon* (v. 3): the representation is mixed; in this verse the *seven heads* and *ten horns* as well as the colour *red* appear to indicate the Roman power (see xiii. 1); but in v. 9 he is clearly identified with Satan, and in v. 15 there are features of the Babylonian Tiamat, who also had many heads: see Ps. lxxiv. 13, 14. The traditional interpretation found here Herod the Great.

*A son, a man child* (v. 5) is here Messiah; the prophecy or description that he will *rule all nations with a rod of iron* is more Jewish than Christian; on the difficulties involved in the explanation that the phrase *caught up to God* refers to the Ascension, see the note following v. 17.

*And the woman fled into the wilderness* (v. 6). The reference to the flight of the Christians to Pella at the investiture of Jerusalem by Vespasian is to be rejected; the church there was not the mother of Messiah. *The wilderness* is referred to as some well-known conception; it is some secluded locality in the second heaven, since it is the scene of the war of v. 7; but see v. 13. As to the *1260 days* see comment on xi. 3.

*And there was war in heaven* (v. 7): in the second heaven, see vv. 1, 6, comment. *Michael* is in the later angelology the military leader of the angelic hosts, Jude 9; Dan. x. 13; xii. 1; in the *Sib. Oracles*, iii. 796-806, the Messianic age on earth is preceded by a heavenly battle; in the Zoroastrian eschatology Angra Manyu with a host of subordinate spirits wages a final conflict with Ahura Mazda. That this is a final conflict in which the lower heavens are permanently cleansed of evil spirits is shown by vv. 8, 9. This expulsion is the first of the series of final struggles; as in current Judaism "the eschatological drama began with the appearance of Michael"; Volz: *Jüd. Eschatologie*, 195.

The song of triumph, vv. 10-12, contains in v. 11 a very

disturbing interpolation or redactional insertion. The subject "they" refers according to the context to Michael and his deathless angels, but the verse itself can only describe Christian martyrs.

The persecution of the woman by the dragon, *vv. 13-17*, is very enigmatic. The mother, in v. 1 *ff.*, the heavenly archetype, appears here to be on earth, but not in a wilderness, as in v. 6: her flight has been interpreted as the dispersion of the church at the first persecution in Jerusalem; or the flight to Pella in 66-70 A.D.; but the apostolic church was not the mother of Messiah.

The *two wings of the great eagle*, the *dragon*,—here a serpent,—casting water out of his mouth as a river, the earth opening her mouth to swallow the river—are all features from some Oriental, presumably Babylonian, myth; the author leaves them unexplained.

The *time, times, and half a time* of v. 14 indicate, as the statements in xi. 2, 3, three and one half years; the word *times* (*καιρὸς*) is to be taken as dual in meaning (but the dual number is not used in New Testament Greek) thus:  $1 + 2 + \frac{1}{2} = 3\frac{1}{2}$ ; see comment on xi. 2.

According to the more approved reading of xiii. 1: *he stood upon the sand of the sea*, the dragon would appear to cast the river from his mouth while moving about in the water, to be therefore a sea-monster, and to emerge from the water to the shore in order to persecute the *remnant of the woman's seed*, when he is joined by the beast.

That this section portrays the birth of Messiah may be regarded as settled. But the delineation of his birth in a work which undertakes to set forth the things that *must shortly come to pass*, i. e., especially the fixation of that birth after the calamities of the last times and the chastisement of Jerusalem, present a perplexing problem. Many students have endeavoured to solve it by the theory of recapitulation. They maintain that at ch. xii. begins a duplication of ch. i.-xi.; that the author commences anew with Messiah's birth and goes

on to his Parousia and the end. The attempt is a two-fold failure; there is no similarity of substance beneath difference of form, and the chronological difficulty remains. To the latter is added the difficulty of the contents. Granted that the reference is to the Messiah Jesus, what Christian could have originated a vision from which all characteristic Christian elements are absent; the ministry, death, and resurrection unnoticed, the child caught up *at birth* into the highest heaven? To this enigma may be added that of the scene of the action; the mother is in the second heaven, *rakia*, where are the sun, moon, and stars; there she brings forth her son, who is caught up to the seventh heaven, but the woman flees into *the* wilderness, apparently now an earthly refuge, since when the dragon has by Michael been cast down to earth he persecutes her, but now she flees again into the wilderness. No exegesis can solve these problems; their existence can only be explained on the hypothesis that the material is from various sources and is of non-Christian origin. Vischer asserts that the source is Jewish, on the basis furnished by a Talmudic tractate in which a Messiah Menachem is as infant swept away by a tempest. Dieterich found here a working over of the Greek myth of the birth of Apollo, at this time current in Asia Minor, according to which Pytho the dragon, warned that a son of Leto (Latona) was to put him to death, strove to kill the pregnant goddess, but the wind Boreas wafts her away to an island where she bears Apollo, who when four days old seeks out and slays Pytho.

Gunkel would derive this section from Babylonian mythic lore, where Tiamat, the seven-headed monster of the deep, strives against the heavenly deities, and in which the sun-woman Damkina bears Marduk, the young sun-god, and both are persecuted by Tiamat, the god of winter and darkness, until when the spring comes, the sun-god conquers and slays his enemy.

Bousset brought forward still more striking parallels from Egypt: Isis, the sun-crowned mother-goddess, after the aging sun-god Osiris has been killed by Typhon, the sea-dragon, brings forth *mid* persecutions the young sun-god Horus, and flees to a desert island while Horus conquers the sea-monster.

Wellhausen sought to establish by analysis a double source: a heavenly conflict with angels and an earthly one with the woman. These were confused by redaction (*Skiz. u. Vorarb.*, vi. 215 ff.).

Even if there be some probability in Wellhausen's position that the original sources must have contained an account of the overthrow of the dragon by the rescued son, there is still the double difficulty of

regarding the mother as the earthly Jerusalem and of ignoring the whole earthly life of Jesus. A possible explanation may lie in the eschatological emphasis. In proportion as the idea prevailed that the essential Messianic function of Jesus as Messiah was to be exercised at the Parousia, would his ministry and death lose their importance, his resurrection and ascension have significance only as means whereby he appears before the throne of the Most High to receive all authority and power ; and his real *Messianic* existence begin when thus he leaves the heaven of heavens to appear with spectacular pomp upon earth to overthrow all opposing human and demonic enemies.

It is evident that no explanation of this section can come from the Old Testament, or from contemporary Judaism ; Vischer's attempt fails both because the matter is so remote and because it is too recent. It is as manifest that an Oriental sun-myth has been appropriated. It may be regarded as probable that our author found it in some source already adapted to Jewish Messianic use ; for it is evident that the birth of Messiah takes place in heaven, in one of the lower heavens of the Jewish series ; a conception which a Christian might retain but would not originate.

The problem of the insertion at just this stage of the action has never been solved, and only surmises can be ventured. Since the author everywhere operates with given material and since this chapter is introductory to xiii., it may be that in some source used the originals were so connected ; it may be that to the author the emphasis or significance of the presentation lay in the expulsion of Satan and his minions from heaven, which for early Christian thought was the beginning of the end : Luke x. 16 ; John xii. 31. And this is the point reached in xi. 15-19.

The two beasts from the sea and the land ; xiii. 1-18.

The final conflict with evil in the heavens ceases when the dragon Satan is cast down to earth, xii. 7-9 ; this is the beginning of earthly hostilities. He is joined by a beast from the sea, many-horned and headed, who receives worship, blasphemes God, wars with and overcomes saints ; and by a beast out of the earth, a lamb in figure, a dragon in voice, who both gives life to the first beast and deceives men into worshipping him. It is a dissolving view, in which, since the three are spiritually one, Satan fades from vision and the beasts to which he gives his power and authority remain upon the screen.

*And I saw a beast coming up out of the sea (xiii. 1):* the beast is the Roman empire; it is its Emperor Nero; it is a preternatural Nero; it is the demonic representative of Roman power: all these elements appear in the presentation. The *seven heads* and *ten horns* are here descriptive of the Roman government; emperors and governors of the ten provinces; see comment on xii. 3, and note after v. 18. The *names of blasphemy* were the titles applied to rulers, especially emperors. The use of such words as *augustus*, *divus*, *deus*, was abhorrent to Jew and Christian alike.

The confused description in vv. 1 and 2—seven heads, ten horns, one mouth—shows that the author operates with complex material, which he does not unify. The *dragon* is the beast of xii. 9.

*One of his heads as though it had been smitten unto death (v. 3):* a characterisation of Nero Cæsar (see note after v. 18). He is the antitype of the slain lamb of v. 6. Whether the phrase: *his death-stroke was healed* refers to supposed or actual death cannot be determined; probably the latter, since this is a later form of the Nero legend; the stroke is a death-stroke; the *wonder* of the *whole world* finds its best explanation in the idea of Nero returning from Hades.

In vv. 4-8 the spiritual features of the dragon pass over as in a dissolving view into those of the beast; the empire (Nero) becomes virtually Antichrist, the Cæsar-cult is the antithesis of the true worship of God.

*Forty and two months (v. 5):* see comment on xi. 2 (Dan. viii. 12, 24).

The wide generality of the description marks it as prophecy rather than history; it can scarcely be brought into relation either with the Neronic persecution of 65 or the Jewish war of 66-70 A.D.

*The book of life (v. 8):* see comment on iii. 5. The words

*of the Lamb that hath been slain* are to be regarded as insertion; the phrase *from the foundations of the world* modifies the verb (Dan. xii. 1).

Verses 9 and 10 contain a warning against force and sedition. Believers must not be tempted by their hostility to hated Rome into impatient and useless violence. Matt. xxvi. 52; Rom. xiii. 1 ff.

*And I saw another beast coming up out of the earth (v. 11):* the symbol or demonic representative of heathen religion, perhaps especially incarnate in the fanatic imperial priesthood of Asia Minor; it comes from below, as demonic in nature; the lamb-like horns express outward gentleness or a simulation of Christianity; the dragon-serpent voice is smooth and enticing.

Verses 12-17 describe the means—a heightening of present influences—by which this deceptive and crafty priesthood will secure a temporary triumph for the emperor-worship when the last ruler, the death-smitten Nero, shall return from the underworld.

*The first beast whose death-stroke was healed (v. 12)* is Nero; so v. 14; see note after v. 18.

*The mark on their right hand or upon their forehead (v. 16)* is either a sign of bondage or service such as slaves and soldiers wear, or a magic prescript used by devotees of a deity; since coins bear such marks and images of deities or deified rulers, the traffic of that time can be carried on only by those who handle the coin, and thus have the name and number of the beast. The Antichrist tradition contains a similar feature. He compels men to accept his sign on forehead or hand, and only those so designated can in the time of the great famine buy bread.

*Here is wisdom (v. 18):* the word denotes here and in xvii. 9 the ability to penetrate apocalyptic mystery.

*The number of the beast* is said to be *the number of a man*, and to be 666.



In later Hebrew as in Greek the letters of the alphabet were used as numerals; every word would thus have a numerical equivalent, a *number*, obtained by finding the sum of its letters. The practice, called gematria, of using the number instead of the word, of finding some hidden meaning in the value of the letters, or letters expressive of numbers, was very common in Jewish and Christian apocalyptic material, and became a fruitful source of fanciful interpretations. Thus the 318 servants of Abraham in Gen. xiv. 14 became a symbol or prophecy of Christ and the crucifixion, because in Greek 318 = τϛη, the first letter of which group resembles the cross while η are the two first letters in the name Jesus: thus because the letters of the word περιστερά (dove) amount to 801, and the letters Alpha and Omega equal 801, it follows that the spirit which descended upon Jesus in the form of a dove at his baptism made him to become the Christ who could say of himself, "I am Alpha and Omega"; Rev. xxii. 13.

Very early attempts were made, even in the time of Irenæus, to solve this problem by the use of Greek-letter values; in later times even Genseric and Napoleon have been discovered. The most probable solution was worked out independently and with curious simultaneousness by a number of scholars: Hebrew and not Greek-letter values are here employed, and the hidden name is Nero(n) Kaisar (נרון קסר), whose value is 666. A striking confirmation of the correctness of this solution is that Irenæus, who could not solve the riddle, says that many manuscripts in his day read 616 instead of 666, a reading which would arise if the word were spelled Nero instead of Neron, the Hebrew form. As Jesus (Ἰησους) in the *Sib. Oracles*, i. 326-330, is 888, so here Nero Antichrist is 666. Other suggestions worthy of mention are: that Caligula is meant, whose names, Gaios Kaiser, in Hebrew consonants would be equal to 616; that *Lateinos* = 666; i.e., the Roman empire is here hidden; that 666 is a symbolic number denoting incompleteness and failure.

That the beast out of the sea is the Roman imperial power, specifically Caligula or Nero or Domitian, may be regarded as settled, because: (a) of the disclosure of his name in his number (xiii. 18; on which verse see comment); (b) of the explanation in the parallel passage, xvii. 7-14. "The returning Nero" is one of the prominent figures of Roman popular expectation, soon transferred to Jewish and Christian apocalyptic anticipation. This expectation appears in three forms (so Bousset): (1) that Nero was not dead, but concealed, and would soon emerge (as in Suetonius, *Nero*, xlvi.; and Tacitus, *Historia*, ii. 8); (2) that Nero had fled to the Parthians and would

return at the head of hostile hosts to avenge himself on the Rome which had rejected him; in 81-2 and 88 A.D. Pseudo-Neros actually appeared in the Orient, but were soon overthrown (Suetonius, *Nero*, 1., and Tacitus, *Historia*, i. 2); (3) that Nero had really died and would reappear from the underworld as a demonic power, a leader of the anti-divine legions, as Antichrist (found in portions of the *Sib. Oracles*).

In chapters xiii. and xvii. the second and third of these representations or expectations appear in a confused form probably due to use of different sources. This Nero is therefore no photograph of the historical, he is of the future, demonic, sub-terrestrial; he rises from the underworld to lead the anti-divine forces in the earthly conflict which follows the casting of Satan from heaven. The second beast is the symbol or demonic representative of heathen religion in its prominent characteristics of fanatical priesthood, pseudo-prophecy, and emperor-worship.

The specific feature of emperor-worship gives some warrant for the conclusion that material from the time of Caligula is used: the Jewish legend of Antichrist is laid under contribution; familiar already in apocalyptic imagery was the representation of Rome and its ruling personalities as dragons. Thus the three who yet are one in spirit—the hurled-down Satan, Nero redivivus, the mystic representative of heathen religion—hover before the imagination of the author as the unearthly foes of Messiah and his people in the conflicts that endure until the appearance from heaven and the final victories.

The vision of the Lamb; xiv. 1-5.

The preceding chapters, xii., xiii., have depicted the anti-divine hosts and leaders in the impending struggle upon the earth. To this vision comes its counterpart; the Messiah-Lamb and his hosts are shown us. The material used has some similarities with vii. 1-8; both are some development of current matter of Jewish origin; this section has been more transformed than the other.

*The Lamb* (xiv. I) is Christ in heaven; see v. 6. Since the anti-divine leaders have been depicted as animals, their chief antagonist is so delineated. *Mount Zion* is either the heavenly in the Jerusalem above (xxi. 1-3 and comment), or the ideal earthly. The former is preferable,—but see vv. 2, 20—; the 144,000 symbolises both completeness ( $12 \times 12$ )

and magnitude (1000); the hosts may be in the second heaven, while the *new song* (v. 3) sung by the harpers in the highest heaven reverberates downward, and can be learned only by the heavenly army, who thus now are prepared to sing it at the impending victory.

*They are virgins* (v. 4): they typify the ideal Christians of a time when asceticism had already begun; they are apparently martyrs, since their life is past, vv. 3, 4; they are in heaven, since they constantly accompany the Lamb, v. 4.

**The three angels; xiv. 6-13.**

When now the hostile forces have been portrayed, and we might expect their activities to be at once set forth, there is characteristic delay. Three angels sweep through heaven, whose loud prophetic proclamations announce: (1) good tidings to those who will fear God and worship him; (2) the overthrow of hostile worldly powers (Babylon-Rome); (3) continued torment of the adherents of heathen worship.

*An eternal Gospel* (v. 6) is not here the Christian offer of salvation, but the welcome proclamation of judgment and blessing to Jehovah worshippers; the word *eternal* here means æonian, pertaining to the new æon or age.

*Babylon* (v. 8) is here anti-divine Rome; the proclamation is anticipative; the overthrow is set forth in ch. xvii.-xviii. See xviii. 12.

Other apocalypses: *Sib. Oracles*, v. 143; *Baruch*, lxvii. 7, present Rome as Babylon; the Old Testament prophecies against her are to be fulfilled anew in the fate of Rome.

Verses 9-12 are, like 8, anticipative; they pre-announce the contents of succeeding chapters, the judgments and punishments of heathen worshippers.

*The beast and his image* (v. 9): see comment on xiii. 14-16. The image was some coin imprint or statue.

*The wine of the wrath of God* (v. 10) is the divine indignation against idolaters, to be manifested by their torment in Gehenna (xxi. 18) in the presence of God's instruments of

vengeance, the holy angels. Since the Lamb was hardly to be originally conceived as descending into Gehenna at the Parousia, the phrase "and in the presence of the Lamb" may be regarded as Christian insertion into characteristically Jewish material.

*From henceforth* (v. 13) is to be connected with the verb *die*; the martyrs in the last conflicts, who die in Messiah's behalf, will be blessed; *their works follow with them* into the heaven, and secure special reward; xx. 4-6.

The final reaping; xiv. 14-20.

After the anticipative mystic judgments of xiv. 6-13, comes the anticipative final act, the reaping. Already in Matt. xiii. 39 the end of the age is called the harvest. Many writers, as Völter and Erbes, regard these verses as the conclusion of some apocalyptic source used; and since they appear to be in no organic connection with the structure, they may well be accepted as passages which the author would not omit from his collection, and which he could only use anticipatively. There is probably in the present section a two-fold harvest: the first (θερισμός) is the mowing or grain harvest, the ingathering of the righteous; the second is the excision of the vine of the earth (Joel iii. 13), the unrighteous, full of clusters flung without distinction into the winepress of wrath for their fate.

*One sitting like unto a son of man* (v. 14) is to be taken as Messiah. The use of the expression *another angel* in v. 15 indicates that the being is here regarded as an angel, but in Jewish apocalypse Messiah is sometimes so figured; this may also explain the obedience of Messiah to the command of another angel.

The *temple* (v. 15) is the heavenly *ναός*; see comment on xi. 19.

The *harvest* is here the *grain* ingathering; sometimes, as Joel iii. 13, reaping is a symbol of destruction; so in vv. 18-20.

*The earth was reaped* (v. 16): such portions as bore grain were reaped; as structure it remains; so in vv. 18, 19.

*Another angel came out from the altar, he that hath power over fire* (v. 18). Since the altar is the altar of burnt offering in the heavenly temple (see comment on xi. 19) and the angel comes forth *out of the interior of* (ἐκ) the altar, it seems natural to regard him as an angel in charge of fire. Moffat (*Hibbert Journal*, Jan., 1904, p. 350) calls attention to the fact that in the Iranian theology Asha Vahista, the Amshaspand of Righteousness, is the angel of fire.

*The winepress* (v. 20) is without the (heavenly) city, the Jerusalem above, but in the third heaven (see comment on xi. 19); and in the terrific judgment blood flows bridle-deep around the steeds of Messiah's armies in heaven (see xix. 14, 15) as far as 40 × 40 furlongs.

**The seven bowls; xv.-xvi.**

This section displays such similarities with that of the seven trumpets in ch. viii.-ix., that a complete independence is highly improbable, but there are no data which furnish a decisive indication of the nature of the evident relation. This group serves the purpose of an introduction to the vision of Rome's overthrow, as did the seven trumpets to the vision of Jerusalem's chastisement in ch. xii. The two series may be variations of some original; or both may be the inventions of the author; the former is more probable.

*Another sign* (xv. 1): see xii. 1, 3; this is a new theme: the contents of the sign are the *seven angels having the seven plagues, which are the last*.

As the opening of the seals is preceded by a song, v. 8-14, so here the pouring of the contents of the bowls follows an outburst of praise, vv. 2-4.

*A glassy sea* (v. 2): see comment on iv. 6; but the conception may not be the same: for explanations of *the beast, his image, his mark, and the number of his name*, see comment on xii. 3, 15, 16, 18. The victors, who may have passed through the fiery sea, sing Moses' song of victory over Egypt (Ex. xv. 1 ff.); but this song is really as a whole excerpts from the Psalms; see Ps. ci. 2; cxxxix. 14; Jer. x.

7; Ps. lxxxvi. 9; cxlv. 17. The words *and the song of the Lamb* are a confusing insertion.

*The temple* (v. 5) is apparently in the highest heaven, since it is near the four living creatures in the divine presence (iv. 6-11); it may not be that mentioned in xi. 19.

The *smoke* (v. 8) is, as in the Old Testament (Ex. xl. 34), a token of divine presence and power; even angels may not now enter.

The first four plagues of the trumpet series, viii. 7-12, affect a third part of the land, the sea, the rivers, the heavenly bodies; these bowl plagues, as last, are more severe, and the effect is universal.

*A great voice out of the temple* (xvi. 1) must be that of God, since (xv. 8) none can now enter.

The first four plagues touch those who have given themselves to emperor and idol worship : since the true and faithful have been preserved from these calamities of the last time (xiv. 1-5), and are no longer upon the earth, the seer can represent these plagues as all-embracing.

*A noisome and grievous sore* (v. 2): like the Old Testament plague of boils; Ex. ix. 10 f. As to the *beast* see comment on xiii. 15, 18.

*The angel of the waters* (v. 5): water, wind (vii. 1), and fire (xiv. 18) have angels who control them.

*The altar* (v. 7): either the souls under the altar, vi. 10; or the altar angel, xiv. 18.

*The throne of the beast* (v. 10) is either actual Rome or its ideal representative.

The sixth bowl, vv. 12-16, is properly no plague; with the seventh it is anticipatory of the contents of xvii., xviii.

The sixth trumpet also pertained to the East, ix. 14-21.

*The great river* (v. 12), the Euphrates, is dried, as in the days of Cyrus, Is. xliv. 27, to make way for the Parthian kings; see xvii. 12, 16.

Since now the great hindrance to a general assembling of

forces has been removed, the leaders are called together, vv. 13, 14.

*Three unclean spirits as it were frogs* (v. 13): according to Persian mythology, the frog is a creature of Ahriman (Satan), and "one of the most hateful" (*Hibbert Journal*, 1904, p. 352). Gunkel regards the frogs as missionaries of Tiamat, the water-dragon, which is prominent in the representation of ch. xii., xiii. For the *dragon*, see xii. 3, 7; the *beast*, xiii. 1; the *false prophet*, xiii. 11.

*Har-Magedon* (v. 16) means apparently "mountain of Megiddo." But the Old Testament Megiddo of 2 Kings xxiii. 29; 2 Chron. xxxv. 22; Zech. xii. 11; is in the plain of Esdraelon. The author however may have believed it a mountain, since it was in the hill country. It was famous as a place of slaughter of Israel's enemies. The spelling varies, and Hilgenfeld's suggestion may be received that "Har" has been corrupted from "Ir," city.

Ewald, applying gematria (see comment on xiii. 18), found that the letters had the same value in Hebrew as those of the words "Rome the Great." Gunkel finds here traces of Babylonian mythology.

The seventh bowl brings the end of the plagues, the punishment of the nations and especially of Rome.

The *bowl upon the air* (v. 17) is effective, because the air is the abode of evil spirits (Eph. ii. 2; vi. 12; Philo, *de Gig.*, 2), and they can produce lightnings, thunders, earthquakes.

**The fall of Babylon-Rome; xvii.-xviii.**

**The scene is apparently upon earth.**

*The great harlot* (xvii. 1) is Rome; see v. 18. The *many waters* are nations, see v. 15; the phrase is from the prophecy against Babylon, Jer. li. 13, where the sense was literal.

Her *fornication* (v. 2) is the contamination of her religious influence, especially emperor-worship, even traffic by means of hateful imaged coin; see comment on xiii. 16.

*A scarlet beast* (v. 3) is here the empire, which sustains the imperial city; but the empire is so identified in thought with the city that the same symbol is used indifferently for both. The *scarlet* indicates the bloody nature of the rule, may refer either to the Jewish war of 66-70 A.D., or the Neronian persecution. As to the *seven heads and ten horns* see comment on xiii. 1.

*Upon her forehead a name written* (v. 5): Roman ladies wore frontlets; and harlots often had their own names upon them (Juvenal, vi. 12, 3).

*The beast that thou sawest was and is not* and *is about to come* (v. 8): the revived Nero from the underworld. See note following this section, xviii. 24; and especially that following xiii. 18.

*Here is the mind that hath wisdom* (v. 9): formal introduction to an important explanation; see comment on xiii. 18. In v. 8 is one solution; here another is given. The *seven heads* are the seven hills on which Rome was built.

*They are seven kings* (v. 10): these are probably Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero, as the *five that are fallen*. Vespasian as the *one that is*, Titus as the *other that is not come*, if the prophecy is *ex eventu*; Titus actually reigned only two years, 79-81 A.D.

*The beast that was, and is not, etc.* (v. 11). The representation apparently includes both Nero and Domitian; but whether Domitian was in the author's mind is doubtful. He was really the eighth, was of the seven only in that he belonged to the Flavian dynasty. But Nero is the beast that was, and a Nero revived would be of the seven, and as the last would go into destruction at Messiah's coming. Thus v. 11 is an attempt to mend the explanation of v. 10, having its cause in the fact that the number of actual emperors had passed the complete seven. But the obscurity is hardly lessened by this. The natural inference is that Domitian is here blended with Nero revived; he was called in his time



a "second Nero," is even designated by Pliny (*Paneg.*, xlviii) as a "most savage beast," *immanissima bellua*.

*The ten horns . . . are ten kings* (v. 12): these are either the governors of the ten Roman provinces, or the Parthian satraps honoured as kings.

This representation of the destruction of Rome by the beast Nero, dropped at v. 13, is resumed in v. 16; thus vv. 14, 15, may be regarded as insertion.

*These shall make war with the Lamb* (v. 14). The phrase does not accord with the contents of the context, which describes the war of the kings with Rome; it has been suggested that it may have followed xvi. 13-16.

Verse 15 contains an allegorised interpretation of v. 1; verses 16, 17 are a more complete explanation of the meaning of vv. 12, 13; Verse 18 is the clearing up of the mystery of v. 1.

The seer is now on earth, and hears from an angel the announcement of the fall of Rome, which is according to xviii. 4-8 either originally accomplished, or subsequently rendered more complete, by the vengeance of the saints. See note following xviii. 24.

Much Old Testament material is incorporated; *e. g.*: 1. Ez. xliii. 2. 2. Is. xxi. 9; Dan. iv. 30. 3. Jer. li. 7; Is. li. 17, 22. 4. Jer. li. 6, 9, 45. 6. Ps. cxxxvii. 8; Jer. l. 15, 29. 7. Is. xlvii. 7, 8. 8. Is. xlvii. 9; Jer. l. 32, 34. 9. Ezek. xxvi. 16, 17; xxvii. 35; Dan. iv. 30.

The wail of the kings is in vv. 9, 10; of the merchants in 11-17<sup>a</sup>; of the marine traffickers in 17<sup>b</sup>-19.

The finality and irrevocability of Rome's fate find expression in the mill-stone flung into the sea (after the model of Jer. li. 63, 64), sinking never to rise, while the angel pronounces her doom; vv. 21-23.

The preparatory judgments end with the seventh bowl; the fall of Babylon-Rome, foreshadowed in xvi. 19, is now set forth, xvii.-xviii In current contemporary Jewish eschatology also the judgment upon

Rome is the final punitive preparation for Messiah's coming. The material is certainly in large part taken from written sources ; we owe to Bousset the clear perception that in ch. xvii. two are used : (*a*) one in which the revived Nero and his assembled armies war against the harlot Rome ; and (*b*) one in which the conflict of the allied hosts is against the Lamb. Compare in ch. xvii. v. 14 with v. 16 ; in vv. 9, 10, there are two interpretations of the number seven ; there are present two forms of the Nero legend : as a leader returned from the East with Parthian allies (11, 12, 16, 17), and as a beast-Nero from the underworld (8, 14, 15).

On the Nero legend see note following chapter xiii. 18. The two elements may be regarded as belonging respectively to the reigns of Vespasian and Domitian.

Ch. xviii. is probably from a separate source, consists largely of excerpts from the prophecies against Tyre and Babylon. In xviii. 4-7 the saints are to be the instruments of God's vengeance ; in 9, 10, the kings bewail the fall of Rome, while in ch. xvii. they hate her and destroy her.

#### Messiah's victory and kingdom ; xix. 1-xx. 6.

The forces that overthrew Rome must themselves be conquered, since they are undivine ; and as they are at once earthly and infernal, they are to be vanquished by heavenly powers, Messiah and his armies ; after which his kingdom can be established.

The introduction, xix. 1-10, is a song of praise over the coming victory, as xiv. 1-5 ; xvi. 1-3 ; a flash of sunshine amid gloom. Then Messiah appears, 11-21, no groom at the wedding-feast as in the song, xix. 7, but as a warrior chief, and with his legions vanquishes the hostile leaders, the beast, the kings, and their armies ; his kingdom is established by the binding of Satan, xx. 1-3, when he and his, among whom the risen martyrs are prominent, rule during the blessed thousand years, xx. 4-6.

The section is in some part the work of the author, as it is connected with preceding material, especially with ch. xii. Messiah from heaven is apparently the now grown child of xii. 4 ; he overthrows the beast and prophet of xiii. 1-18 ; and calls into his kingdom the martyrs of vi. 9-11. Some Persian eschatological traces appear ; the binding of the dragon-Satan in xx. 1-2 resembles, and may be a variant of, the Persian legend of the chaining of the dragon Azi-Dahak ; but the main thought is Jewish.

The subsection xix. 1-10 is transitional, at once a cry of joy over prostrate Rome and an anticipative shout of triumph. The praise moves from circumference to centre: (a) much people, (b) the 24 elders, (c) the four living creatures, (d) from within the throne; then comes the refluxence.

*Hallelujah* (xix. 1) means "Praise ye Jehovah." (Ps. civ. 35 ff.)

*The great harlot* (v. 2): see xvii. 1, comment.

*Her smoke* (v. 3): the author forgets his symbol of the harlot; the city is in his thought. (Is. xxxiv. 10.)

*The elders and living creatures* (v. 4): see iv. 4-8. (Is. vi. 1; Ps. xlvii. 8.)

*A voice came forth from the throne* (v. 5): presumably of Messiah caught up thither, xii. 5.

*The marriage of the Lamb is come* (v. 7). The passage is distinctly Christian; the author finds no incongruity in representing the Lamb as marrying. His *wife* was in Jewish thought the new Jerusalem; since here Messiah disappears after the millennium of xx. 1-6 the bride may well be, because of xix. 8, either the Church, or specifically, the martyrs.

Verse 10 is apparently a polemic thrust against angel worship (Bousset). It is repeated in xxii. 8, 9. The prophets, whether angelic or human, are to be believed, not worshipped; since they have the testimony concerning Jesus which comes from the possession of the true prophetic spirit.

The Parousia, the visible appearance of Messiah, follows in xix. 11-xx. 6. The representation is truly Jewish; Messiah is no prince of peace, but a blood-stained warrior and judge.

*A white horse* (v. 11) is a symbol of conquest; see vi. 4; *he that sat thereon* is Messiah.

*Many diadems* (v. 12): because he is *king of kings*; the rhetoric is subordinated to the idea; only one crown is worn at one time. The *name written* is said to be known to him-

self only, while in v. 13 he is named the *word of God*. Either this name is to be entirely dissociated from the written one, as a common designation of Messiah is too insignificant of the real essence, or *οἶδεν* is to be translated "knew" instead of "know," and the thought is that the time of the Parousia will first bring the true conception of the Logos-nature and therefore reveal the Logos-name. At all events this is the last and greatest Messianic mystery of the book; whether the Logos idea of the Fourth Gospel is here cannot be determined. The Targumic "Memra Jehovah" ("word of God") is a personification of God himself as present and active in the realm of historical realities unto the ends of salvation; his word, which is the utterance of his deepest secret being, is thus objectified and given life. Near also is the thought to that of Heb. iv. 12, where the word of God is "living and active and sharper than any two-edged sword." It is by no means improbable that the original fragment described Deity himself coming to judgment and to establish his kingdom; the paucity of distinctly Christian features in the whole section is noticeable.

*A sharp sword* (v. 15): see i. 16; ii. 12. *The winepress of wrath* is also in xiv. 19, 20. Compare, for these verses, Ps. ii. 8; Is. xi. 4; Joel iii. 13; Deut. x. 17; Dan. ii. 47.

In vv. 17, 18, an angel calls the vultures to feast on the slain in the coming battle of vv. 19-21.

*The beast* (v. 19): see xiii. 1 and comment; on the *kings of the earth*, xvii. 12; the *false prophet*, xvi. 13.

*They were both cast alive into the lake of fire* (v. 20). The lake of fire is, in this book, the equivalent of Gehenna, according to the current Jewish belief, a place or condition of punishment in the subterranean regions. The greatest variety of opinion prevailed concerning it; its punishments were corporeal or spiritual, retributive or reformatory, temporary or eternal, its very existence brief or never-ending: thus wide were the divergencies. In the Revelation, the

plunge into it is apparently annihilation; see xx. 14, 15; xxi. 8; Satan, the beast, and the false prophet, however, remain alive, xx. 10.

The agents of evil and of false religion being destroyed, xix. 11-21, the *fons et origo*, the dragon-Satan, is now to be subjugated; xx. 1-3.

*The abyss* (xx. 1): see comment on ix. 2.

*The dragon* (v. 2): see comment on xii. 3, 9.

*A thousand years*: the duration of the Messianic kingdom. In the later Jewish eschatology Messiah's reign is a period of limited duration, and becomes the transitional era lying between Olam Hazze, "this age," and Olam Habba, "the age to come." It belongs indeed to the new age, but is introductory to the completed kingdom of God. To this transitional stage belong in Jewish thought, the (first) appearance of Messiah, his victory over foes, a resurrection of the righteous from Sheol, the domination of Messiah over the heathen world. At its close, amid the mystic warfare with Gog and Magog, Messiah disappears, Jehovah becomes sole ruler, and amid scenes of judgment, general resurrection, the renewal of the earth, the descent of the heavenly Jerusalem, there is established the true Olam Habba, the eternal age. How largely these conceptions dominated apostolic thought may be seen in 1 Cor. xv. 21-28, where we find: (a) a (second) coming of Messiah, (b) a resurrection of the faithful, (c) a rule of Messiah "until he shall have put all enemies under his feet," (d) a surrender of authority by Messiah and the sole rule of God who becomes "all in all."

The length of the Messianic kingdom was variously estimated: as 400 years, as 2000 years; but a common opinion, based on Gen. ii. 2 and Ps. xc. 4, was that it was a Sabbatic rest of a thousand years. See *Barnabas*, xv. 4; Irenæus, *Hær.*, v. 28, 3.

The blessed life of the martyrs and confessors in the millennium is next set forth; vv. 4-6.

*I saw thrones and they sat upon them (v. 4):* the subject is indefinite; Messiah is unmentioned, the angels may be judges; some suppose the 24 elders occupy the thrones; while in the last great judgment there is one throne and one judge; v. 12. The citizens of the Messianic kingdom are apparently as a first order the martyrs, who have had in *this* passage, not in vi. 9, their abode in the underworld (see the words *the rest of the dead lived not again*, etc., v. 5); and as a second order the living who had not worshipped the beast.

*The rest of the dead (v. 5)* obviously includes Christians who had not been martyred. The reward of martyrdom is thus admittance into this impending and glorious, if temporary, Messianic kingdom; and those who withstand the awful stress of the last attacks of false religion, and bear their testimony in fidelity, who *overcome* (ii. 7, 11, 17, 26; iii. 5, 12, 21), live and reign also with them. Here lies the practical emphasis of the book; martyrdom is glorified. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 23; 1 Thess. iv. 14) expects a resurrection of all the Christian dead at the Parousia.

*Over these the second death hath no power (v. 6):* see v. 14, and comment on ii. 11.

The idea of an intermediate temporary kingdom of Messiah appears in the Slavonic Enoch and in Fourth Ezra, as well as here and in 1 Cor. xv. 21-28; and since it is a prominent element of Talmudic eschatology, is clearly of Jewish origin.

The post-Messianic conflict and the completed kingdom; xx. 7-xxii. 5.

The Messianic millennial reign, xx. 1-6, is but a transition element. Satan still lives, Death and Hades exist; evil must be completely overthrown. Whenever this temporary Messianic reign appears, general resurrection and the great day of judgment follow instead of introducing it; the final conflict over, the perfected eternal state, Olam Habba, succeeds.

This section contains: (a) the loosing of Satan and the final conflict, xx. 7-10; (b) a general resurrection and judgment, xx. 11-15;

(c) the renewed heaven and earth, xxi. 1-8; (d) the heavenly Jerusalem, the abode of the saints, xxi. 9-xxii. 5.

The material is largely Jewish, with little that is specifically Christian, and that, as the suggestion of a co-regency in xxii. 3, bears traces of being insertion; the verses or clauses where the Lamb appears often occasion grammatical difficulty or confuse the representation; see xxi. 9, 14, 22, 23, 27; xxii. 1, 3.

*The thousand years (v. 7):* see comment on v. 2.

*Satan shall be loosed out of his prison:* see vv. 2, 3, and comment.

No explanation of the cause or means of the loosing is given, but it is apparently done that he may summon to their doom the distant nations in the four corners of the earth, and be himself destroyed.

*Gog and Magog (v. 8).* Ezekiel (xxxviii.-xxxix.) gives a semi-apocalyptic picture of a conflict following the resurrection of Israel, in which Jehovah overthrows the forces of a mystic leader Gog from the land of Magog (Armenia?). In Jewish eschatology the "days of Messiah" are followed by the "days of Gog and Magog," as is here the millennium; and Gog and Magog, as two persons, are prominent also in the Antichrist tradition. These chiefs from afar with their armies gather around Jerusalem, and are "killed by a flame which proceeds from the throne of glory" (Targum Jer.). So here Messiah has overthrown the beast (Roman power) and his followers, xix. 17-21; there remain the vast idolatrous populations of the outlying barbarian world beyond the limits of the empire, especially in the Orient, *the number of whom is as the sands of the sea.* They are not overcome by Messiah, who fades from view since the years of his reign are over, but by *fire out of heaven.*

*The devil that deceived them (v. 10):* see xii. 9 and comment.

As to the *lake of fire* see comment on ii. 11; xix. 20. Since the devil, the beast, and the false prophet, who are thrown *alive* into the lake, are here specially made exceptional as

suffering for ever while in both passages no mention is made of their followers as suffering a like fate, it seems a fair inference that the lake of fire meant for the masses, not torment, but complete destruction, annihilation.

**The (final) general resurrection and judgment follow, vv. 11-15.**

*A great white throne (v. 11)*; one only, as expressive of the final monocracy (so 1 Cor. xv. 28); *he that sat upon it* is God, not Messiah.

*Books were opened (v. 12)*: the books of remembrance or deeds; on *the book of life*, see comment, iii. 5; inasmuch as men are judged *according to their works*, the names in the book of life are determined by the data in the book of remembrance. Comp. Dan. vii. 10; Ps. xxvii. 4; lxix. 28; Jer. xvii. 10.

Verse 13 is in specification of v. 12: that all might be judged *the sea gave up the dead*; perhaps here their bodies only are included; and *death*, which here means "the land of death," may denote the bodily resting-place of those who die upon earth, while Hades is the abiding-place of the souls of the dead. Death and Hades are now *cast into the lake of fire*, which here means annihilation. To Paul also death is the last enemy to be abolished; 1 Cor. xv. 26.

As to the *book of life (v. 15)* see comment on iii. 5.

Whether the casting into the lake of fire signifies destruction or torment, is not entirely clear. The nature of fire favours the thought of total destruction; in v. 14 the expression certainly has that force; the mention of Satan, the beast, and the false prophet as *tormented for ever* indicates an especial severity of punishment, which the mass of sinners is spared.

Judgment is now finished, a new heaven and a new earth are to be established for the saints, xxi. 1-xxii. 5. Much of the delineation comes from the Old Testament, and is found in similar form in



current apocalypses. This renewal of heaven and earth is precisely the point at which the "age to come," the *Olam Habba*, is established.

*And the sea is no more (xxi. 1).* This absence of the sea is a feature of other apocalypses; it is traditionary insertion here: the abyss or deep was the abode of the great dragon (Tiamat), and of hostile powers; it must vanish in the perfect age; it was often conceived as destroyed by conflagration.

*And I saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God (v. 2).* There was a current idea that God had created in the beginning a perfect Jerusalem, which had been caught up into heaven from Eden on Adam's sin, and was preserved there until the "age to come," when it would descend. See also Gal. iv. 26; Heb. xii. 22. Others asserted its heavenly pre-existence. Sometimes its descent was placed at the inception of a Messianic era conceived as eternal, rather than after its close, as is here the case.

The glimpse of *v. 2* is anticipative of the detailed vision, xxi. 9-xxii. 5.

The song of *vv. 3, 4*, is largely a cento of Old Testament passages; see Is. viii. 8; xxv. 8; lxv. 17, 19; Jer. xxxi. 16; Ezek. xxxvii. 27; Zech. ii. 10.

The solemn certification from Jehovah, *vv. 5-8*, appears like a fitting close to the book, and may be taken from some source; in its present position it probably serves, with *vv. 1-4*, as prelude to the vision, xxi. 10-xxii. 5.

*The Alpha and the Omega (v. 6):* see comment on i. 8.

As to the *lake which burneth with fire* and the *second death (v. 8)*, see comment on xix. 20; xx. 14.

The description of the new heavenly Jerusalem follows, xxi. 9-xxii. 5. Some of its features, such as the presence of surrounding nations with their kings and the exclusion of their base elements (xxi. 23-27), find an explanation in the opinion that the delineation was in whole or in part originally a vision of the *earthly* Jerusalem which would be established at the beginning of Messiah's reign.

*One of the seven angels (xxi. 9):* see xv. 6; xvii. 1.

*Twelve gates (v. 12).* In other descriptions also this Sumerian feature of astronomy is found. There are twelve portals, three toward each point of the compass, and from each the sun issues in turn. Twelve is also a complete number; so Israel idealised its tribes. The twelve *angels* are angelwatchmen.

Verse 14 is clearly a Christian insertion, in which the heavenly Jerusalem appears as a symbol of the Christian Church, built on the foundation of the twelve apostles. The conception of the city with foundations is also in Heb. xi. 10.

The *city* (vv. 16-21) is described as a cube, 1500 miles on each edge, the wall about it 225 feet high; a conception difficult to the imagination; as is that of the wall and foundations in vv. 18-21, since one cannot determine whether the foundations, each some 500 miles long, were set with jewels or each composed of one. The *precious* stones are nearly the same as those in the ephod of the High-priest; Ex. xxviii. 17-21; see also Ezek. xxviii. 13 ff

Jewish imagination disported itself in pictures of such splendours.

*The twelve gates were twelve pearls (v. 21).* Rabbi Johanan said (Baba Bathra, l. 21, a), "The Holy One will bring precious stones and pearls, each measuring 30 x 30 cubits, and after polishing them down to 20 cubits by 20, will place them in the gates of Jerusalem."

*And I saw no temple (v. 22):* since ordinary Jewish expectation magnified the temple service in the coming age,—though there are exceptions,—and since the word Lamb occurs in the verse, we have probably a Christian insertion, an expression both of hostility to the continual validity of the law in the "age to come," and of the spiritual quality of that perfect life; believers then live permanently in God as now on earth they transiently abide in temples. For Christian idea of temple as transient, see Acts vii. 47-50.

In *v.* 23 the words "*and the lamp thereof is the Lamb*" form a confusing insertion; the *glory of God* (on the word see comment on Acts vii. 2) is the Shekina, the all-illuminating Presence which renders the lamp unnecessary.

Verses 24-27 belonged to some description of a new earthly and not a heavenly Jerusalem; see note introductory to xxi. 9 above; but since the material is adapted from the Old Testament, the incongruity may result from that. Jerusalem is here in the midst of friendly nations; kings and the righteous have entrance and exit, only the unrighteous are excluded.

Into this heavenly Jerusalem come the glories of Eden, and the fulfilment of prophecy

*The river of the water of life* (xxii. 1) is from Gen. ii. 10 and Ezek. xlvii. 1-12, where it issues from beneath the temple.

*The tree of life* (*v.* 2) is possibly a spreading banyan (an Oriental feature,) so huge that it covers the stream and flourishes on both sides of it; the representation is obscure; the main features are from Ezek. xlvii. 11, 12; where the leaves of the tree are for healing; the addition of the phrase "*of the nations*" is peculiar, since here judgment is already pronounced. The phrase "*and of the Lamb*" (*v.* 3) is out of harmony with the remainder of the verse, and especially with the two following.

Conclusion: xxii. 6-21.

The epilogue contains: an affirmation of the truth of the previous apocalypse and the nearness of fulfilment (6-7); a warning against angel-worship (8-9); a second affirmation of the imminence of the Parousia (10-15); a certification from Jesus that these words are for the (seven) churches (16-17); a threat against tampering with the contents of the volume (18-19); a third assertion of the nearness of the Parousia (20).

Style and contents resemble closely chapters i.-iii.; Jesus is here as there the chief speaker. Two ideas dominate: the words are true and sacred, the visions seen are of events near at hand.

Verses 6, 7, are mainly a repetition of i. 1-3 (comment on which); verses 8, 9, are a mixture of the contents of i. 9, 10, with those of xix. 9, 10 (see comment on xix. 9, 10).

*And he saith unto me (v. 10)*; as shown by v. 12 the speaker is Jesus.

*He that is unrighteous, etc. (v. 11)*. The significance of the verse lies in its position between the words "*the time is at hand*," v. 10, and "*Behold, I come quickly*," v. 12. So imminent is the end, so near the footsteps of the returning Jesus, that there is no time for change. Let each go his way; the record is made.

On *Alpha and Omega (v. 13)* see i. 8, comment; on *first and last*, i. 18 and ii. 8, comment.

Verses 14, 15, are based upon xxi. 12 and xxii. 2; presuppose Jerusalem in the midst of the nations, see xxi. 24-27, comment.

On the *morning star (v. 16)* see ii. 28, comment.

*The spirit and the bride (v. 17)*: the spirit is the Holy Spirit or Christ as spirit; the *bride* the heavenly Jerusalem, xxi. 2.

The threat of vv. 18, 19, is addressed to hearers and readers. Such warnings were appended to ancient books; and apocalypses by their nature were especially liable to license of treatment.

Two voices ring out at the last, in whose accents are condensed the hope and longing of the persecuted church: from heaven the enthroned Messiah shouts down: "*Yea, I come quickly*"; and the supplicating answer climbs the sky: "*Amen; come, Lord Jesus.*" And after eighteen centuries gone, with other but with equal faith our lips repeat the prayer: "*Come, Lord Jesus.*"



# THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.

---

## INTRODUCTION.

1. The author of the Gospel announces in xx. 31 the purpose of his endeavour: *These are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye may have life in his name.* Since the word "ye" must refer especially to Christians, who already believed that Jesus was the Christ, it follows that the author's intent lies in the words "Son of God": in the Church which indeed believes in the Messiah, belief in him as the Son of God is absent or defective, and Christian life is thereby endangered; the existing presentations of Jesus, oral or written, do not meet the exigencies of the situation; another picture of Jesus, another interpretation of his person, is demanded. The task is first of all doctrinal, Christological.

2. Jesus is in his true being the Logos (Word), existent in the beginning, intimate with God, a divine being (*θεός*, John i. 1, 2); the sole instrument of creation (i. 3); the illuminating principle in humanity (i. 4, 9); he at length became flesh (i. 14) so that men beheld his glory which was as of an only-begotten from God, whom he declared unto men (i. 18). As thus incarnate, he first comes before men in the function of prophet (i. 19-xii. 50).

John the Baptist at once recognises him as the Lamb of God, descended from heaven, Son of God, to manifest whom is his own mission (i. 29-34): Jesus begins his gathering of disciples, who at once confess him Son of God (i. 43-51).

As greater than Moses and Elijah, he manifests his omnipotence by seven stupendous "signs": the turning of water into wine (ii. 1-11); the healing of the nobleman's son at a distance (iv. 46-54); the restoration of the man lame thirty and eight years (v. 1-9); the feeding the five thousand with five loaves and two fishes (vi. 1-14); the walking upon the water (vi. 15-21); the giving sight to the man born blind (ix. 1-12); the bringing back to life of Lazarus four days dead (xi. 1-44). Most of these signs are introductory to discourse material; in these conversations or monologues, whether addressed to hostile Jews, to disciples, or to Pilate, the chief theme is the person of Jesus himself or some aspect of his relation to the Father or some certification of his claim; in the seven-fold repeated "*I am*" he sets forth his nature and relations (*the bread of life*, vi. 35; *the light of the world*, viii. 12; *before Abraham*, viii. 58; *the door*, x. 7; *the good shepherd*, x. 11; *the resurrection and the life*, xi. 25; *the true vine*, xv 1).

His knowledge approaches omniscience; the character of Peter, the history of the Samaritan woman, the death of Lazarus far away, his own coming death and resurrection from the first, the character of Judas from the first—he knows them all; he may ask, but he needs not (i. 42; iv. 18; xi. 11; ii. 19; vi. 70; ii. 25).

Thus in guise and function as prophet, having announced himself as Son of God and revealed the Father's will, having wrought miracles of omnipotence, having been rejected by his people, he utters a final prophetic word of self-revelation, xii. 44-50.

He now appears in the function of priest. On the night before the Passover, while the Jewish high-priest is already preparing for his festal function, Jesus the true high-priest makes ready to consecrate his own chosen disciples. He symbolises their cleansing by the solemn ceremony of the foot-washing (xiii. 1-20), points out and excludes Judas and

sends him on his task of betrayal (xiii. 21-30), and when now they are all clean, prepares them for the fortunes which await them when he has been lifted up by a long discourse (xiii. 31-xvi. 33) in which he sets forth more clearly his own divine nature, commands them to mutual love, promises the presence of the Paraclete, and the indwelling of the Father and himself within them. This priestly function closes with the high-priestly intercession: request for his own glorification, for those given him by the Father and for the believers who should follow, a last petition for their unity and mutual love (ch. xvii.).

Jesus is now presented as the true king, apparently defeated but in truth royally triumphant (xviii.-xx.). While he is in the garden beyond Kidron Judas and the band come to arrest him; they fall impotent, but he allows himself to be taken; his hour is come (xviii. 1-9); before Annas and Pilate he bears himself royally, declares himself a king in a kingdom not of this world (xviii. 12-38), until Pilate with fear endeavours to release him, but yields to Jewish clamour and condemns (xviii. 39-xix. 16).

Crucified, he shows no pain or weakness; gives over his mother to the beloved disciple, calls for drink that the Scriptures might be accomplished, says "*It is finished*," bows his head in death (xix. 17-31), is buried by Joseph and Nicodemus (xix. 31-42). On the first day of the week Peter and the other disciple find the tomb empty, Mary Magdalene sees the risen Son of God who announces his ascension (xx. 1-18). At evening he comes, doors being closed, to the disciples, shows them his wounds, and gives them the Holy Spirit; and eight days after convinces Thomas, who salutes him as God.

Once again he comes to a little company in Galilee, miraculously feeds them and helps them to food, restores Peter and gives the external guidance of the Church to him, contrasts the future fates of Peter and the beloved disciple (ch. xxi.).



3. If now we examine the relations of this Gospel to the Synoptics, the results are striking and suggestive. The contents differ widely: only about eight per cent. of the matter of this Gospel is found in the other three; while of this a small portion consists in isolated sentences (iv. 44; v. 8; xii. 25; xiii. 16, 20, 21, 38; xv. 20; xvi. 32), the larger part appears in more connected form (the Baptist, i. 19-34; the cleansing of the temple, ii. 13-16; the nobleman at Capernaum, iv. 46-54; the feeding of the multitude, vi. 1-13; the walking upon the sea, vi. 16-21; the anointing, xii. 1-8; the entrance into Jerusalem, xii. 12-16; the Passion, xviii.-xix.; perhaps a post-resurrection appearance, xx. 19-22). Scrutiny of these common passages reveals clearly the fact that the Johannine author had before him our Synoptics in their present form rather than the sources from which they were composed, as will be shown in some detail in the comment on these sections; the agreement extends to unimportant words and their position in the sentence; in some cases the text is a mixture of the features of all three Synoptic accounts. Of more significance is the appearance of the Synoptic features and phraseology in narrative and discourse material which is peculiar to John; *e. g.*, into the account of the healing at Bethesda (John v. 1-9) are interwoven expressions from the healing of the palsied man at Capernaum (Mk. ii. 3-12); in the Johannine narrative of the anointing by Mary in Bethany (xii. 1-11) there are features clearly borrowed from Luke's account of a visit at a much earlier time and at another place (Lk. x. 38-42), and from his account of an anointing in Galilee by a sinful woman (vii. 37-39); see especially the note following xii. 11 in the commentary. So many and so convincing are the evidences of the literary dependence of John upon the Synoptics that as to this point scholars as widely divergent as Zahn and Holtzmann are agreed. This dependence is in many cases manifested in such a manner as to justify or even compel the

inference that the author is not an eye-witness supplementing the Synoptic account by his own minute remembrances, and pursuing an independent course, but a writer somewhat remote from the events, who therefore endeavours to vivify his picture by a careful selection of material from the Synoptics; now excerpting from one, now from another, since he is uncertain which is the more original. This conclusion is not invalidated by the presence of many details absent from the Synoptics and both vivid and circumstantial; since, as Drummond has well shown (*Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, 375-379), vividness and circumstantiality are the especial traits of remote and apocryphal tradition, and in this Gospel precisely those narratives which are most vivid and graphic are those whose historicity is least assured.

In the case of a Gospel so largely original or drawn from sources to us inaccessible, and presupposing the common use of our first three Gospels, one naturally queries why the author excerpted the sections cited above and omitted others of equal importance. The answer is in most cases not difficult: the feeding of the multitude and the walking upon the lake (vi. 1-13, 16-21) both serve as illustrations of the omnipotence of Jesus and introduce the discourse upon Jesus as the True Bread (see introduction to vi. 1-71); the cleansing of the temple appears at the beginning rather than the end of the activity in Jerusalem because in this Gospel Jesus appears at and from the first with the loftiest Messianic claims and prerogatives; the situation demanded a new emphasis upon the subordinate relation of the Baptist to Jesus (see below § 4 and comment on i. 7); the whole history of the Passion as given in Mark was derided by opponents as manifesting weakness, ignorance, defeat, and despair, and a new presentation in accord with the higher Christology was a pressing need.

Since the Gospel is so largely different from the Synoptics, almost the entire contents as outlined in § 2 may be regarded

as the author's addition to the earlier presentations; their function of fulfilling his purpose to delineate Jesus from the view-point of the higher Christology is there indicated.

When now we turn to inquire what portions of the Synoptic biography were omitted and to search out the causes for their omission, the conclusions indicate a similar purpose. The absence of nearly all that biography naturally suggested the inference, first announced by Clement of Alexandria and still current, that the purpose of the author was to supplement the Synoptic tradition. But the use of portions of that tradition proves that the fourth Gospel is from the historical point of view no mere supplement, and a supplement would naturally have included much omitted Galilean tradition. The general solution to the problem of the omissions is found in the Christological purpose stated above (§ 1); since the Gospel is a *Christological* supplement, whatsoever in the Synoptics does not serve the author's purpose is either ignored or re-interpreted. Absent therefore are the genealogies and the birth-stories, since they only relate to earthly being; absent are the narratives of the child-life, the baptism, the temptation, the agony in Gethsemane, the cry of despair upon the cross, since they savour of a weakness and imperfection in ill accord with the lofty Christology; the transfiguration would only disturb, since its significance is in the *new* dignity of Jesus in the eyes of disciples to whom his Messiahship has just been revealed, while in John this has been known from the first (i. 41, 49); the many healings of demoniacs and of ordinary diseases would add no strength to the argument since Jewish physicians healed and their exorcists cast out demons (Matt. xii. 27); the discourses of the Synoptics and their parables have as a common theme the kingdom of heaven, its laws and their application to the lives of men; while the Johannine author is chiefly concerned with the person of Christ.

But by this means the antitheses of the two presentations

are heightened; on the one side a beginning with the lineage of Joseph, on the other "the abysses of eternity," a Logos who before the creation was with God and was god; here an ending of the earthly life with the despairing cry: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me"; there the surrender of the spirit with the calm utterance, spoken as if to oneself: "It is finished." And between these termini the details show the same characteristic differences. They are partly of fact: in the Synoptics the scene of the ministry of Jesus is, save the few last days, in Galilee; it continues apparently about one year; the temple cleansing is at its end; the crucifixion is on the day after the Passover; Simon of Cyrene carries the cross: in John the principal ministry is in Judea and the Galilee journeys are episodes; its continuance is about three years; the temple cleansing is at its beginning; the crucifixion is on the day of the Jewish Passover meal; Jesus bears his own cross. But the differences are more largely of "atmosphere," of interpretation: over against the Logos-Christ as the main outlines of his portraiture were summarised above (§ 2), stands the Jesus who with all his endowments and Messianic functions is a man who grows and wrestles and feels his human limitations, is a teacher heard gladly by the common people, quick to feel their woes and heal their maladies, a reformer to stand with courage against the abuses of his times, a self-forgetful Voice which speaks rarely of itself, but ever of the things of the kingdom of heaven.

As to the relation of this Gospel to the Revelation of John, see Introduction to the Revelation, § 4.

4. One prominent feature of the Gospel is at first sight apologetic in character: the controversies with the Jews. Chapters v.-x. are so constructed that from the miracle-narratives or the appearance of Jesus at the feasts arise interviews with the Jews which become more and more controversial in tone and sometimes end with denunciation

or hatred (v. 42, 44; viii. 44, 55, 59; ix. 41). These sections contain objections made against the Messianic claims: Jesus is from Galilee (vii. 41, 42); he is a Samaritan (viii. 48); he has no witness save himself for his pretensions (v. 31; viii. 13); he claims equality with God (v. 18). When now we examine these objections and the resulting replies and discourses of Jesus, specific traces of a later period than that of the public ministry are very manifest. The historical Jesus has before him Scribes, Pharisees, Herodians, Sadducees; his polemic is against their false legalism, their pride, their greed, their hypocrisy; in this Gospel these distinctions have nearly vanished; it is "the Jews" who confront Jesus; his polemic is against their unbelief in his person as that of the exalted pre-existent heaven-descended Son of God. When one considers how in the more credible Synoptic narrative Jesus bids even his most intimate disciples keep his Messiahship a secret (Mk. viii. 30; Lk. ix. 21), one must concede with Weitzsäcker that the picture of Jesus waging a controversy at Jerusalem with Jews concerning his divinity or humanity as Messiah is clearly unhistorical and that these Jews and their arguments are the second-century realities such as confronted Justin and produced the *Dialogue with Trypho, a Jew*.

As a part of this anti-Jewish apologetic may well be included the prominence given the Baptist; the interpretation of his mission which was suggested in the Synoptics but here thrusts itself unexpectedly into the speculations of the prologue (i. 6-8, 15). John is not the light, not Messiah, he is from below, he is only a voice of testimony to Jesus as the pre-existent, heavenly World-Saviour (see comment on i. 6, 7, 29-34; iii. 28-32). Yet there is no polemic against the Baptist, and the researches of Baldensperger have discovered no evidence of many disciples remaining to him in the apostolic or sub-apostolic age; in Ephesus only a little group is seen, and that in dissolution (Acts xix. 1-7). This promin-

ence of John has its cause therefore in the use which the Jews made of the Synoptic narrative of the relations of John and Jesus. They said: John was before Jesus, he baptised him as a sinner needing repentance; Jesus himself testified that no mortal man was greater than John. And the answer is: This greatest of mortals testified that Jesus was no mortal but an immortal, come from above, a World-Saviour, descended to die as a divine sacrifice, a Lamb of God. The peculiarity of the answer is that it is made *to the Church* and only nominally to the Jews; it is his Christology, endangered by the attack, which the author hastens to defend and strengthen *for the sake of the Church*. If this be so as respects the Baptist, it furnishes a solution of the insertion of the long controversies of the middle chapters of the Gospel, and especially of one prominent and unpleasant feature: their cold and repellent tone; contrast Matt. xxiii. 37. The hostile Jews of the author's time are before his eye; his purpose is not to convert, not even for their sake to confute; he will notice their arguments and sneers only to offset them by a presentation which deprives them of all their designed influence over his fellow-Christians. Even the long farewell discourses with their teaching of the future presence of Christ as Spirit within the Church may be in part a needed defence against the sneer that the Christians' Messiah promised to come soon in clouds from heaven, and now when long decades had gone no sign of his Parousia was on the sky; and the marked subordination of the Son may be an answer to the Jewish charge that the Christians had repudiated monotheism.

The endangered Christology and religion needed defence and support against other influences operative mainly within the Church. Irenæus, a specialist in heresies, clearly saw that the fourth Gospel was written to offset the teachings of the Gnostic Cerinthus (*Hær.*, III. xi. 1) While this danger from Gnosticism is openly combated in the first

Epistle, in the Gospel the polemic is less manifest. The same anxiety for the brotherhood and unity of the Church, threatened by Gnosticism, which the Epistle reveals, breathes even in the farewell discourses of ch. xiii.-xvii.; the same desire to oppose the Docetic heresy which finds expression in the formula "Jesus Christ come in the flesh" (1 John iv. 2, 3; 2 John 7) is found in the Gospel in the assertion "the Word became flesh" (i. 14). The details of the crucifixion (xix. 17-42) are apparently selected with the purpose of showing that it was the real Christ, and not a phantom as the Gnostics asserted, who suffered and died: *e. g.*, Jesus bears his own cross (xix. 17; see Mk. xv. 21) and there is no need of Simon of Cyrene, who according to the Gnostics was crucified instead of Jesus; the disciple whom Jesus loved is near the cross at the very hour when the Gnostics asserted that John was upon the Mount of Olives receiving heavenly mysteries from the æon Christ; the transfixed side and the blood and water are proof of genuine corporeality; the stress placed upon the feature of the wounded hands and side of the risen Jesus is best explained as in opposition to the Docetic idea of a pure phantasm. The placing the Logos in the beginning and making him the instrument of the *whole* creation (i. 1-3) is hardly unintentional antithesis to Gnostic speculations which placed the Logos among the later and inferior æons. However slight may be the traces of anti-Gnostic polemic, the Gospel abounds in indications of the Gnostic tendency and atmosphere. Its early and favourable reception by Gnostics outside the Church shows how largely it suited the demands of the time. The very terms of the prologue (ἀρχή, λόγος, ζωή, φῶς, σκοτία, πλήρωμα, μονογενής) are among the widely used names of Gnostic æons or potencies; the verb γινώσκω is used twenty-five times, and the chief element of eternal life is declared to be knowledge (xvii. 3); salvation is in its deepest essence the enlightenment which comes from the Logos who is the light

of the world; the antitheses of light and darkness, of the things from above and from below, of the two classes of man, are heightened; the Christology is so spiritualised that despite the insertion of human elements the picture of Jesus becomes unreal; he needs no food, knows all things, prays for the bystanders' sake and not his own (xi. 41, 42), walks on the water when there appears no special human need (vi. 17-21), often mysteriously vanishes (viii. 59; xii. 36, comment), he needs not to die, even his dying thirst is not clearly real (xix. 28), and he shows no trace of suffering; the historical is so subordinated to the symbolic that the chief persons have become types (see comment after iii. 21, introduction to iv. 1-42, xx. 24-29); an unreality thereby steals into the representation, so that, *e. g.*, even the relations between Jesus and his mother appear distant and formal (ii. 4).

The influence of Alexandrian eclecticism, manifest in the Pauline literature and Hebrews, is especially apparent in the prologue (i. 1-18), as the comment will show. Whether the author was acquainted with the writings of Philo is uncertain and unimportant; there is no imitation, but the Philonic idea of the Logos as mediator between God and the world, partaking in some measure of the qualities of both, is here appropriated as familiar; its form is here determined by the apparent purpose of the author to include similar Old Testament phraseology and Gnostic terms, and thus make the prologue a real irenicon.

5. The Gospel, as we possess it, is not from one hand. Even if vii. 53-viii. 11 be omitted from consideration as a late insertion (see introduction to the section), the addition of ch. xxi. is probably from some disciple of the author; the reasons for this inference are given in the proper place. Of some import are the asserted transpositions and the breaks in the order of narrative and discourse, the presence of paradoxes and incongruities. In the prologue i. 6-8, 15, appear



to interrupt the course of thought; iii. 22-30 is by many regarded as once following i. 51, and all intervening material as transferred or new addition; vi. 1 is a proper sequent of iv. 54, since they give account of a Galilean ministry, and ch. v. has the appearance of an interloper; vii. 15-24 presupposes the historical situation of v. 1-47 rather than of vii. 1-14; x. 26, 27 is a continuance of x. 4-18, though months (vii. 2; x. 22) intervene; if ch. xv. and xvi. are taken out, ch. xiv. and xvii. have a good connection, and the middle chapters could easily be considered as a duplicate tradition, since so many of the thoughts of xiii. 31-xiv. 31 are repeated; ch. xviii. 25-27 is better connected with vv. 12-18 than with v. 24; ch. vii. 21, despite ii. 11, iv. 54, speaks of *one* sign (v. 5-9) as if it were the only miracle, while vii. 3 appears to imply that the disciples in Jerusalem had seen none as yet.

From such features have arisen numerous hypotheses of partition; many of these assert an apostolic basis with post-apostolic enlargement, therefore a literary history similar to Matthew or Luke; the advocates differ widely in details. Where differences of source are disregarded, we find often assertions that the Gospel has suffered redistribution of its material.

Both hypotheses contain true elements. Written sources are used; we have already noted (§ 3) the employment of Synoptic material; the narratives peculiar to the Gospel occasionally show traces of the use of written tradition [see, *e. g.*, note (f.) following xi. 46 in comment]; and where the dependence is not manifest there are good grounds for supposing that the material is not the pure product of invention.

The recently discovered Syriac text gives a different order for parts of ch. xviii.; the *Diatessaron* of Tatian places many of the sections of this Gospel in a different connection so that, *e. g.*, the Galilean narratives are grouped together with Synoptic passages as parts of one continuous ministry in

Galilee, and the interview with Nicodemus (iii. 1-21) is placed after the cleansing of the temple at the beginning of Passion week; by this means ch. iii. 2, 11-15 (and indeed the whole narrative) receives a better setting; and it is truly suggestive that in the Gospel the interview follows a cleansing of the temple; there is certainly some reason to believe that Tatian had before him an edition of this Gospel in which the order was not the same as at present.

As respects the discourse material the situation is more evident, since we possess in the first Epistle an aggregation of doctrinal sections; in which the want of connection, of order, and the many repetitions reveal the author's peculiarity, so that the presence of the same features in the Gospel is not to be put to the account of deliberate rearrangement of material. If this be true of didactic sections, why may not the narratives have been marked by the same indifference concerning incongruities and repetitions? One fact is certain: that the present form of the Gospel is no accident; there is relation and studied connection; later events and sayings refer to earlier; even in those sections where dislocations are suspected these connective features appear. It is probable that the author of the appendix, ch. xxi., edited the Gospel and that since he manifests such an interest in the comparison of Peter with "the disciple whom Jesus loved" some or all of the passages showing the same trait are in form at least due to him; that his is the last pen distinctly that of a redactor.

There are indications that the structure of the Gospel was determined by, or has undergone changes of form originating from, three different interests: (*a*) one which was more historical in that an attempt was made to adjust the material to the Synoptic type and chronology; (*b*) one which sought to group the material around the feasts at Jerusalem and give the contents a conformity with their leading ideas or symbolism; (*c*) one which was distinctly Christological and

sought to set forth the Logos-Christ. in disregard of historical sequence and from ideal points of view, in his successive activities and manifestation as heavenly prophet (i. 19-xii. 50), priest (xiii.-xvii.), and king (xviii.-xx.).

It is possible, but not probable, that these interests were present in one person and represented in one attempt to arrange the material: many indications (such as the apparent absence of the word "Passover" from the text of vi. 4 as the Alogi, Irenæus, Origen, and Cyril of Alexandria read it) favour the conclusion that a succession of changes were caused by them; the extent cannot be determined since we have not the original form, but the general unity of style and treatment forbid the inference that they were very extensive; certainly the Christological interest was most determinative, whether it gave the initial or final form to the Gospel.

One may well question whether a vague knowledge of this complexity of composition does not appear in the earliest recorded tradition of the origin of the Gospel: the Muratorian Fragment (180-200 A.D.) contains the statement that John wrote the fourth Gospel in his own name and that the other disciples revised it.

6. Ancient tradition is unanimous in the assertion that the fourth Gospel is later than the Synoptics. Since Luke is probably from the last decade of the first century, and is used by the author of the fourth Gospel, and since some time must be allowed for its coming into circulation and acknowledged standing, it is only a fair inference that the fourth Gospel was not composed until after the year 100 A.D. On the other hand it may be assumed as highly probable, though the matter is not beyond controversy, that Justin the Martyr about 152-3 A.D. (Harnack, *Chronologie*, 278) quoted the Gospel, and thus we may fairly assume its composition as some years earlier. Between 100 and 140 A.D., therefore, the composition is to be placed.

All attempts at a more precise determination of the date lack cogency; the apparent quotation of 1 John iv 3 in Polycarp's *Epistle to the Philippians* is poor proof of composition of the Gospel before 110 A.D., since the supposed quotation may be only a common anti-Docetic phrase, the date of Polycarp's letter is in question, and evidence as to the Epistle is not decisive for the Gospel; Pfleiderer's conclusion that John v. 43 refers to Barkochba and the Jewish rebellion of 132-5 A.D. will be shared by few; inferences from the presence or absence of Gnostic features or polemics are inconclusive; the microscopic examination of Barnabas, the letters of Clement and Ignatius, the Papias fragments, or the Didache, etc., by Zahn (*Gesch. des N T Kanons*, I. ii. 899 ff) has only demonstrated the presence of "Johannine echoes," and the common use of second-century religious phraseology not invented or first brought into use by the author of the Gospel; use by Basilides is uncertain; absence of use, where one might expect use, is susceptible of many explanations and is in itself no proof of non-existence, since ancient writings came irregularly into circulation. Of much import is the fact emphasised by Wendt (*Das Johevglm*, 164-7) and by him urged in favour of his thesis of a late origin for most of the narrative material of the Gospel, that Justin and other early writers who show some knowledge of the sayings of the Gospel are apparently unacquainted with its narratives, that Tatian is the first writer who makes use of them.

7 The problem of the person of the author is vexed and complicated; a volume is needed for its adequate presentation; only an outline can be sketched and probable conclusions indicated.

The first traditions concerning the author come from the last quarter of the second century, when Theophilus of Antioch, the Muratorian Fragment, and Irenæus ascribe the fourth Gospel to an author John. Theophilus calls him

inspired but does not further describe him; the others apparently regard him as the apostle. Later writers follow these statements; the tradition becomes universal; the place of composition is regarded as Asia Minor. A brief examination of the evidence concerning the Apostle John is necessary. John of Galilee, son of Zebedee, a fisherman (Mk. i. 20), was one of the earliest disciples of Jesus and a constant follower. He was of about the same age as Jesus, unlettered (Acts iv. 13), of developed character (Mk. iii. 17) and mature enough to become a leader (Acts iii. 1, 11; iv. 13; viii. 14); he was enthusiastic, ambitious (Mk. x. 35-40), devoted, intense (Mk. iii. 17) but narrow in sympathies, inclined to fanaticism (Mk. ix. 38-40; Lk. ix. 54-56). After the death of Jesus he is prominent at Jerusalem; he is mentioned by Paul (Gal. ii. 9) as present at the council at Jerusalem (about 50 A.D.), as apparently a pillar-apostle, and as agreeing to remain a missionary to the Jews only. Thus he disappears from view in Palestine, but Mk. x. 39 contains in the form of a prophecy a very convincing indication that at the time when that Gospel was written (70-80 A.D.) John had died a martyr's death; for it is in the highest degree improbable that in the fluent state of tradition at that time and with James already a martyr (Acts xii. 2) this saying concerning the cup and the baptism should have been applied without discrimination to both, *were John still alive*. This martyrdom of John has further confirmation in the important testimony of Papias of Asia Minor (about 140 A.D.) that John and his brother James were put to death by the Jews; for though the works of Papias are now lost the statement that the second book contained this information is made by two writers who were probably familiar with that writing: Philippus Sidetes in the fifth, and Georgios Hamartolos in the ninth century. Despite efforts to discredit this evidence,—*e. g.*, Zahn tried to show that the John mentioned was the Baptist,—the value of it is very considerable. To this testimony two additions come

from Oriental sources: the Syriac Martyrology (411 A.D.) states that December 26th is the day for the celebration of the martyrdom of John and James the apostles at Jerusalem as the 28th is of Paul and Symeon Cephas at Rome; and in the 21st homily of Aphraates (343 A.D.) after mention of Stephen, Peter, and Paul as martyrs it is added that "James and John went in the footsteps of their master Christ." The same connection of James and John is found in the Armenian and Ethiopic calendars, and in the Gothic missal; the martyrdom of both is indicated, but at this later time exposure of life and not its actual loss is sometimes spoken of as martyrdom. Clement of Alexandria says (about 200 A.D.) that "the teaching of the apostles . . . ends with Nero" (68 A.D.).

The evidence of Mark x. 39 and of Papias is very important; the other citations are late, but precisely because they run counter to a very wide-spread tradition that John died a natural death they are entitled to the more consideration. The place of martyrdom is not mentioned by Papias, but since he says the Jews were the murderers it is a fair inference that the locality was Jerusalem; this is confirmed by the Martyrology. To this positive evidence may be added the less valuable negative: Acts xx. 17-38, the Petrine epistles, the Pastoral letters know of no apostle in Asia Minor save Paul; Ignatius of Antioch, writing to the Ephesian church (110-130 A.D.), reminds them of Paul, but apparently knows of no other apostle ever resident there.

But the latter half of the second century, abounding in legends Gnostic and Orthodox concerning John, both connects him with Ephesus and with the authorship of the fourth Gospel. That these attempts were especially numerous and vigorous among the Gnostics is indicated by the Leucian *Acts of John*. On the Orthodox side the chief witnesses are Irenæus, Theophilus of Antioch, the Muratorian Fragment, Polycrates, and Clement of Alexandria. Into the full detail

of their statements it is impossible to enter; if wideness of currency in the belief that John of Galilee went to Asia Minor, wrote a gospel there, and peacefully died at an advanced age were the sole criterion of historicity there would be an immediate end of uncertainty; but the statements are in part contradictory, often fantastic, and abound in such improbabilities that they compel partial if not entire disbelief; *e. g.*, Irenæus the chief witness seems to promise us much when he tells us that as a boy he used to listen to Polycarp who told of his intercourse with John and others who had seen the Lord, but he destroys our confidence by informing us that this very John told the elders of Asia Minor that Jesus' ministry was nearly twenty years in duration and his age about fifty at death, that Jesus taught that in the age to come each vine would bear one hundred quintillion grapes, each grape to furnish more than two hundred gallons of wine, etc. (*Heresies*, ii. 22; v. 33). Equally filled with unreliable tradition are the Muratorian Fragment and the word of Polycrates; Andrew is with John when the Gospel is written, the "fellow-disciples and bishops" have a part in revising; Philip the evangelist is confused with Philip the apostle. One conclusion, important and undoubted, comes from a survey of the tradition: there was at the close of the first century and into the opening years of the second a prominent Christian named John resident in Asia Minor. He was the real, or reputed, author of the Revelation (Rev. i. 4; Justin, *Dialogue* 81); Irenæus's elders apparently obtained their millenarian traditions from him; he was probably the Presbyter John who was still living when Papias began to inquire into the oral tradition (Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 39) and whom Papias clearly distinguishes from the deceased apostle of the same name. When we pass behind Irenæus and Theophilus the status is yet more indecisive. The Alogi (about 165 A.D.) attribute both Gospel and Revelation to Cerinthus the Gnostic, and although their

testimony may be biased by their opposition to the Logos Christology, they would scarcely have ventured on such a denial of Johannine authorship in the face of a fixed and certain tradition.

More important is the attitude of Justin (150-160 A.D.): he is apparently acquainted with the fourth Gospel, his Christology, especially the Logos doctrine, is largely similar; we expect copious quotations to substantiate his positions, if he had before him a writing believed by him to be apostolic in which doctrines so congruous with his own are presented as coming from the very mouth of Jesus or the pen of an apostle; but there is a curious reserve; he deviates from the Johannine Christology and especially from the eschatology; he quotes the Synoptics scores of times; once only and that loosely, does he clearly cite the fourth Gospel; he disregards its chronology, and gives the Synoptical history the preference. The obvious inference is that he did not regard the Gospel as of apostolic authorship.

The internal evidence is more harmonious. The sentences are more Hebraic than Greek in structure; the author or last redactor was probably of Jewish origin, but familiar with Greek in early years. The acquaintance with Palestinian localities may be derived from the special traditions which the author uses or come from his own observations. If there are some features which indicate the eye-witness (see i. 14, comment), there are conversely many sections which betray vagueness, and there is often a representation far from imageable; while the most picturesque narratives, such as in ch. iv. and xi., are precisely those which are on other grounds to be regarded as of least historicity.

While Andrew, Peter, Philip, and Thomas of the apostolic group are named, James and John, prominent in the Synoptic tradition, receive no mention, save that in the appendix (xxi. 2) they appear nameless, but as sons of Zebedee. In the beginning (i. 35-42) there is an unnamed disciple who



shares with Andrew the honour of being the very first who follow Jesus, and thus precede Peter, who is brought to Jesus by Andrew; later on a nameless disciple, designated as the "one whom Jesus loved," appears nearest Jesus at the final supper (xiii. 23-25) so that only through him can Peter get an answer from Jesus: he is apparently the "other disciple" who with Peter follows Jesus after his arrest and through whom only Peter is admitted into the court of the high-priest (xviii. 15, 16); he is at the cross when Peter has denied and fled (xix. 26); he outruns Peter to the sepulchre and is the first in the resurrection faith, believing before Peter and others have their vision of Jesus (xx. 1-9); in the appendix he needs no restoration as does Peter after his desertion, but is to be the "abiding" disciple, the last to abide (*μὲνειν*, both in i. 38, 39 and xxi. 23) as he was the first (xxi. 20-23). This namelessness is intentional; its motive is not modesty, it is glorification; greater in spirit even than Peter is this unnamed disciple. No author would so conceal and magnify himself; it is some disciple of a disciple who thus exalts his master: from him all this is natural and praiseworthy. This unnamed disciple is the great witness of the Gospel; he has seen and borne testimony; to him the author appeals (xix. 35; comment): he was dead when xxi. 22, 23 was written. That he was not by the author regarded as one of the apostles may be inferred from the strange absence of the word "apostle" from the Gospel, from the fact that the phrase "one of the twelve" occurs only twice and that in reproach (Judas the traitor and Thomas of slow and imperfect faith, vi. 71; xx. 25), and from the elevation of the nameless "disciple" above Peter the chief of the apostles.

Let us sum up. Possible, indeed, but improbable in the extreme is authorship by John of Zebedee, because: (1) John was, at the death of Jesus, toward middle life, an unlearned disciple (Acts iv. 13), a conservative apostle to the circumcision (Gal. ii. 9), and the Parousia expectation would tend

to prevent study and culture such as the Gospel displays; (2) he died a martyr's death, probably at Jerusalem, before 70 A.D.—the evidence is given above—while the Gospel is both by tradition and internal evidence to be assigned to a period 30–60 years later; (3) the relations of the Gospel to the Synoptic tradition are not such as evidence an eye-witness as its author; there is dependence on the earlier Gospels, even evident conflation from them, such as indicates a want of personal observation; the new historical material is surely in part an elaboration of Synoptic suggestions, as will be shown in the several sections; an eye-witness in adding new material would, were he a Galilean, enrich the narrative by Galilean as well as Judean traditions; since the Synoptics were formed from the early Galilean oral tradition which John helped to fix and extend, a Gospel from him would naturally display the same characteristics, even if it contained new material, but here there is wide difference of style, environment, atmosphere, topics, new interests, new opponents—see proof above, § 4; (4) the similarity of phrase and idea in the utterances of the different persons, in the most varied situations, the agreement in style and teaching with the first Epistle, the resultant monotony of treatment, indicate a wide remove from personal observation; the sovereign treatment of the history discloses a similar relation; the adherents of Johannine authorship find much embarrassment here; Weiss concedes that misunderstandings were manufactured, original words and contexts obliterated, the historical colouring lost, and the representation manipulated for didactic ends; and Drummond finds the narrative concerning Lazarus “more like a land of dreams than of waking reality,” and his Gospel from an eye-witness of less historical value than the Synoptics which are non-apostolic in authorship, as if an eye-witness were so forgetful or so perverted as to be reduced to the invention of material: both these scholars save the genuineness at the expense of the historicity

if not at the cost of the probity of the "disciple whom Jesus loved"; (5) an original participant in the Galilean ministry of Jesus would, of all disciples, be the last to obliterate so many traces of time and place, substitute for the profound but simple teaching which "the common people heard gladly" enigmatic utterances which confuse the learned and not even the disciples can comprehend, carry back into that brief year of ministry the conditions, concepts, and controversies of the post-apostolic age, and make the very lips of Jesus most voluble in the interests of a post-Pauline Christology.

The point of departure toward a positive hypothesis is found in the recognition of the fact that in Asia Minor during the sub-apostolic age the phrases "disciples" and "disciples of the Lord" designated not only immediate and personal associates and followers of Jesus, but other early Palestinian believers who afterward removed into Gentile lands and were held in special esteem as the bearers of precious traditions: this first-mentioned use of *μαθητῆς* is frequent in the Gospels—the word is not used in the Epistles,—the second is found in the words of Papias as quoted by Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 39 (Harnack, *Chronologie*, 660).

Sometime during the last third of the first century a disciple in the second sense indicated, John by name, perhaps a priest (Acts vi. 7), resident at Jerusalem, familiar with Jewish learning and with the earlier and later forms of Christian tradition as they developed at Jerusalem, went to Asia Minor, came into high esteem, lived on into the opening years of the second century, died of old age. He brought much Jewish Messianic-apocalyptic tradition, was the chief agent in its collection into the book of Revelation, of which he was perhaps a redactor; he became to the "elders" of Asia Minor a venerable source of Christian tradition, a "witness," a great authority; even during his lifetime, as the "memoirs" of the Synoptics came into circu-

lation, his venerable age and his Palestinian origin brought about the beginning of confusion of his personality with that of the Galilean John, of whose end there was no widespread tradition. Soon after the death (for he was dead when *xxi.* 23 was written) of this "disciple," "elder," "witness," an Asian Christian, discerning the demand for a presentation of Jesus in accordance with the higher Christology and other current conditions, composed from the traditions of this "witness," from the Synoptics, from oral sources, from ideal invention, a "spiritual" Gospel, and put it forth under the authority—not in the name of—this ancient witness, whose personality was in the common mind already confluent with that of the Galilean John.

As respects the common tradition this hypothesis explains: (1) the fact that Ephesus did not become a famous religious centre, of apostolic renown, like Rome and Jerusalem, as would naturally have been the result in case an apostle from the twelve had long resided there; (2) the silence of Ignatius, who (115-130 A.D.) apparently knows only of Paul as an apostle at Ephesus (*To Ephesians*, 12); (3) the evidence of Papias, who obtains through disciples of the elders *oral* (not *written*) traditions from a living "elder" and "disciple of the Lord" named John; (4) the statement of Polycrates that John of Ephesus, whom he does not call "apostle" as he (mistakenly) does Philip, was a priest, wore a sacerdotal plate, was "witness" and "teacher"; (5) the attribution of non-apostolic traditions to the Apostle John by Irenæus, their source being the "elder"; and the presence in Irenæus's sources of the phrase "the disciple of the Lord," and legends such as of the meeting of John and Cerinthus; (6) the curious statement of the Muratorian Fragment that to Andrew, *one of the apostles*, it was revealed that John, *one of the disciples*, was to write the Gospel; non-apostolic authorship is surely a permissible interpretation of these words; they indicate

some such underlying tradition; (7) the vacillation of Clemens Alex., who now says that the teaching of the apostles, including Paul, ends with Nero (*Stromata*, vii. 17), now gives us a tradition such as that of John's conversion of the robber, tradition which both asserts and implies long residence and old age in Asia; (8) the late appearance of the tradition of two Johns resident in Ephesus in the sub-apostolic age.

As respects the contents of the Gospel this hypothesis explains: (9) the traces of familiarity with Palestinian localities, especially Jerusalem; (10) the prominence of the Judean ministry and the absence of important additions to the Galilean; (11) the dependence on the Synoptics; (12) the insertion of sub-apostolic traditions suggested by the Synoptics; (13) the absence of the word "apostle" and an attitude of depreciation in respect to the twelve; (14) the parallelism between Peter and "the disciple whom Jesus loved"; (15) the want of interest in the historical and emphasis on the ideal and doctrinal; (16) and especially, as elaborated above, the peculiar mixture of the old and the new, the apostolic and the post-apostolic, which is farthest from the possibilities of the eye-witness: just as the late author of Chronicles, using the books of Samuel-Kings as chief source, carried back into the far days of David the ideas and institutions of his own post-exilic time, so really, if in lesser measure, the gospel author, with the Synoptics as source, has inserted into the picture of his Son of David the conceptions and doctrines, the confusions and controversies of the sub-apostolic age.

8. These conditions of its origin only in part determine the limitations and excellences of this Gospel. From the standpoint of historical criticism it is inferior to the Synoptics; its tone toward the unbelieving world is cold and repellent; its Christ is somewhat unreal, for to picture the finite and the infinite as united in one consciousness will always surpass human endeavour. To its age it was of the greatest service: its polemic rendered it useful for immediate exigencies; its

prologue with the Logos-Christology disarmed the Gnostic and won for the Christian faith great masses of the Gentile world who would have turned their backs to a Jewish Messiah and who because of their former polytheism could never have accepted as Saviour any lesser personality than a deity: its appendix won for it and its doctrine the support of Rome and the West. Also to every age it has a message: its lofty teaching of God the Father, its fine mysticism, its exalted conceptions of future existence, its emphasis upon the *life* of Jesus as a revelation of the divine, its pleas for brotherhood, are all of perpetual worth and power; even those who cannot accept the Logos-Christ of its pages can follow the Jesus whose "meat and drink it was to do his Father's will."

Thus even historical deficiencies may become a source of charm and command; the truth of fiction may be most life-giving; it is the ideal which endures.



# THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.

---

## COMMENTARY.

**The Prologue.** The theme is the Logos, who is set forth : (a) in his essential nature and relations with God, i. 1, 2 ; (b) as the instrument of creation, v. 3 ; (c) as the true revelatory principle in the universe, vv. 4-13 ; (d) as incarnate revealer, the historical Jesus Christ, who is also an only-begotten divinity, vv. 14-18.

As the aim of the Gospel is the establishment, against all opposition from Ebionism, Judaism, Greek philosophy, Gnosticism, of belief in Jesus as the divine Son of God, the prologue is a fitting introduction. The wondrous earthly history, the stupendous miracles, the marvellous words, find a complete causal explanation in the postulate of a pre-existent Word, having the nature of deity, for a time incarnate in the world he had created. The history of such a being cannot commence with his public ministry, as in Mark ; or his marvellous birth, as in Luke ; or a genealogy as in Matthew ; the beginning is *in the beginning*, before the world was. The explanation of his Sonship does not lie, as in the Christology of adoption, in any descent of the Spirit upon him, any delegated authority, any self-chosen mission or function, any obedience unto death ; but in his own *unique nature*, the mystery of his being ; he is no Jewish Messiah, no archetypal man, he is a divinity manifest for a little time in flesh. The order of the thought is determined by the relations and forms of the Logos ; the procedure of the description is from the most transcendent to the phenomenal ; from the heavenly deity of v. 1 to the earthly flesh of v. 14.

*In the beginning* (i. 1).—This phrase is the predicate of the first clause: *the Logos was in the beginning*; the predi-



cation is not that of eternal existence, but does not contradict it; *i. e.*, the phrase *in the beginning* is not equivalent to "without beginning": the very phrase indicates temporal relations, and is here (as in Gen. i. 1) to be connected with the creation (v. 3); in the beginning, before the world *came into being*, the Logos *was*; for the Logos is so far from finite and derivative being that the verb "became," "came into being" (*ἐγένετο*), may not be used. The emphasis lies on the words *in the beginning*; hereby is made prominent the opposition to any Gnostic teaching which would make the Logos a derived and inferior æon; *e. g.*, in the Valentinian system the Logos belongs to the third pair of æons; the word *was* excludes emanation. Philo's Logos also is "neither uncreate as God, neither created as you" (*Quis Rerum*, 42).

*The Word.*—The Word (*λόγος*) is, in this prologue, that transcendent, pre-existent, personal, being, who is like God in his nature, the instrument of creation, the mediator of life and light to the world, and who at the incarnation was manifested to men as the Son of God, Jesus Christ.

Wherever the conception of God is abstract and transcendental, there arises a necessity for the hypothesis of powers or beings whose function it is to mediate between God and the phenomenal world. Among the later Palestinian and Eastern Jews such mediators were Metraton, Shekina, Ruach (Spirit), bath-kol: Memra (Word) is the most frequently mentioned, is often substituted in the later Targums—vernacular translations of the Old Testament, used in Palestine and other countries where Aramaic was spoken—for the word Elohim, and appears to represent especially God as active in history; the Memra is "Creator," "Lord over all," "Judge," "Saviour," etc. The Jews of the West became familiar with Greek philosophic ideas and terms and probably before the Christian era had used the Greek word *λόγοι* (which with Heraclitus designated the eternal reason immanent in the world of transient phenomena, with the Stoics the world-soul) in the singular and plural as name for mediatorial activities or beings.

At Alexandria Philo, the Jewish syncretistic philosopher, contem-

porary with Jesus, unites many features of the Old Testament idea of "wisdom" as the principle of the creation and government of the universe (Prov. viii, 22-ix, 10) with Platonic and Stoic conceptions; his Logoi are archetypes and active causes by which the transcendent God establishes relations with the world; the Logos appears to be the unity of all the divine rational energies going forth from the great First Cause to form and maintain the universe. As mediator between God and the world the Logos partakes of the nature of both; as the original subjective thought of God the Logos is divine, Deity; as the thought of God become objective, realised, is undivine, creature: the representation hovers between personality and thinghood.

The similarities of the Philonic and Johannine ideas of the Logos are not to be denied: in both the Logos is a divine potency creating the universe, vivifying, illuminating, humanity; is *a*, not *the*, Deity; sustains a double relation of sameness and difference as respects God; is "Son," "Life," "oldest Son"; makes all things as the Father bids him; is Paraclete; in him the glory of God is revealed: the differences are as evident, especially that concerning the personality; the Johannine author regards the Logos as conscious individuality before the incarnation. There is no imitation of Philo, but the similarity of atmosphere and phrase is best explained on the hypothesis of close acquaintance.

Over against Gnostic fulness of æons is thus placed the one familiar mediator, who is before all, sole instrument of creation, sole source of spiritual life.

*With God.*—The preposition (*παρά*) signifies closeness of relation, and excludes identity. In Philo (*Somn.*, I. 41) the Logos is the *ἀνθὴλιον ἀνγῆν*, the "reflected ray-brilliance" from God the sun.

*And the Word was God.*—Since the word God is predicate and has no definite article as in the preceding clause, its sense is best given by prefixing the indefinite article: the Word was a God, a deity; hereby both personal identity is excluded and subordination expressed.

In all ancient Greek and early Christian literature the word *θεός* (God, a God) is very elastic; among the Stoics men were called *θεοί*; Gnostic teachers were so addressed; Philo says (*De Hom. Mut.*, 22) that "he who is inspired may reasonably be called God"; and in a

comment on Gen. xxi. 12 (*De Somn.*, I. 39) remarks that the article with θεός indicates that "the true God" is meant, while without the article the word denotes "his most ancient Logos"; this distinction was observed by the Christian theologian Origen; and Hippolytus says (*Theophany*, 8) that "the believer, having become immortal, will be God." In 2 Cor. iv. 4 Paul calls Satan θεός.

Thus the first verse sets forth, in opposition to Jews and Gnostics, the anteriority, closeness to God, divine nature, of the Logos; and in Johannine manner verse 2 repeats the essential elements for emphasis.

*All things were made by him (v. 3).*—The preposition διὰ, *by* or *through*, designates the means, not the ultimate cause. The repetition of the thought in negative form is for emphasis; the Gnostic doctrines of the self-existence of matter, and of the creation of the world by some inferior æon or æons, and of the separation of the creator from the redeemer, are here negatived. To Philo (*Cherubim*, 35) the Logos is the instrument (ὄργανον) of creation.

*In him was life (v. 4).*—Life (ζωή) is one of the fundamental concepts of the Gospel; it here denotes: (a) the sum total of all those energies which are included in self-existent (not self-originated) personal being; (v. 26); in the whole Gospel its meanings are varied: (b) the self-existent Son (Logos) as the spiritual energiser (xiv. 6); (c) the result of those spiritual energies operative in humanity, that blessed existence which reaches its culmination in the Olam Habba, but is given as a present potency in the incarnate Son and therefore belongs also to this age; (d) it is completed in the resurrection of believers, which is one of life (v. 29), but is truly begun in that present spiritual resurrection which has already come through faith and knowledge (v. 24, 25; xvii. 3), so that αἰώνιος (*eternal*) is no necessary adjective, and has in this Gospel become an *epitheton ornans*.

The author here operates with a widely-known and familiar conception. In the O. T. Jehovah is the God of life over against the dead

gods of heathendom, is the source of living energies, calls living beings into existence through his word, and maintains them; the Logoi of the Stoics are active energies, life-giving: still more close is the relation between Logos and life among the Gnostics, since in the Valentinian Ogdoad (group of eight æons) these two (λόγος and ζωή) form the third pair or syzygy.

*The life was the light of men.*—The life of the Logos comes to men as light, the universal principle of revelation; as incarnate the Logos is the Light of the world [viii. 12], but before incarnation was active in humanity; all truth is from him. To Philo God is “the sun of suns” and the Logos his reflection, at which men are able to gaze directly (*De Somn.*, I. 41).

*The light shineth in the darkness* (v. 5).—The present tense indicates a permanent function of the Logos as light; therefore both the pre-incarnate and the incarnate activities are included. Difficult of determination is the question whether καταλαμβάνειν means *apprehended* or *overcame*; either (a) the Logos, since only mediately manifested before the incarnation, was not then able to bring light and salvation to the darkness, i. e., to the world of unilluminated and sinful men, and therefore an incarnation, a direct manifestation, was needed; or (b) the power of the Logos as light, even in mediate manifestation through Judaism and Greek philosophy, was irresistible in its limited sphere: the former interpretation is preferable.

*There came a man* (v. 6).—John the Baptist is now introduced in his relation to the Logos and the incarnation; (a) he follows the Logos, so i. 15; (b) he *came into being* (ἐγένετο) while the Logos *was* in the beginning, i. 1; (c) he is man (ἄνθρωπος) while the Logos is θεός; (d) he is indeed *sent from God*, not however coming from above as the Logos (see iii. 31, comment); (e) his function is only that of prophetic witness, vv. 7, 8. See Introduction §4, and i. 31; iii. 31, comment.

In vv. 9-13 we have a summary of the history of the *incarnate*, not the *fleshless* Logos, because: (a) the activity of the Baptist precedes, vv. 6-8; (b) the verb ἦλθε (*came*) is used in v. 11; (c) the belief in his name (v. 12) presupposes historical existence.

*The true light was coming into the world (v. 9).*—This reading of the margin is preferable, because (a) of the connection with v. 8; the thought is that even while the Baptist was beginning his testimony, the true light was coming; (b) the phrase "come into the world" is often used in connection with the Son (see ix. 39; xi. 27; xii. 46; xvi. 28; xviii. 37); (c) if the translation of the margin is rejected, this verse is only a repetition of the thought of v. 4.

*He was in the world (v. 10).*—The *world* is here, not the *all things* of v. 3, but the general body of humanity, averted from the light and captive to sin; the word has come to be a technical term in this ethical and religious sense and abounds in the Gospel and first Epistle (see, *e. g.*, xii. 31; xv. 18, 19; xvii. 14; 1 John, ii. 15; iv. 5); this world is ruled by a "prince," Satan (xii. 31; xiv. 30; xvi. 11): in a few instances the word denotes the universe (xvii. 5; xxi. 25). Because the world as a whole is thus constituted it becomes the tragic fate of the Logos-Christ, that *the world knew him not*.

*He came unto his own (v. 11).*—He made the world, and it is *his own*, therefore it should receive and love him. *His own* are not here the patriarchs, nor the Jews as race, who reject him; but the mass of humanity. The emphasis lies on the thought of possession or right of ownership by virtue of the act of creation: the rejection becomes thereby more inexcusable and tragic.

*As many as received him (v. 12).*—These form the exception to the generalisation of v. 11; they are the believers of the period of the earthly ministry; the receiving is an inward spiritual process (vi. 47, 56; xiv. 20; xv. 4; xvii. 23)

conditioned by faith *on his name*, i. e., his true nature as expressed by his name, Jesus Christ ; by such union believers *become* (not *are*) *children* of God (only also in xi. 52 children, in 1 John four times, iii. 1, 2, 10 ; v. 2) while the Logos-Christ alone is his Son. That this gift of *right* (*ἐξουσία* usually means a transmitted, not an inherent, authority), which appears at first sight to be external and forensic, initiates a mystical spiritual process, is shown by v. 13, where the resulting new life is traced to its causal principle, God ; with emphasis it is denied that it can arise from any lower source ; there is especial polemic against the Gnostic teaching that some by virtue of their birth and nature attain salvation by their own will alone.

*And the Word became flesh* (v. 14).—In the progress of the prologue from the most abstract to the concrete and sensuous, the Logos which in verse 1 was presented as *θεός* (God), now is delineated in his lowest form of existence but one most needful for the salvation of men. The word Logos, unused since verse 1, is here repeated, since the purpose is to emphasise the thought that the person who was historically manifested as Jesus is the same as that divine being who was in the beginning with God. The term *flesh* is chosen, instead of *ἄνθρωπος* (man), not because the author would deny the humanity of Jesus, but because he would affirm (over against the Docetic Gnosticism which taught that the body of Christ was a phantom or of non-human substance) the reality of incarnation, the corporeality and unity of the manifested life.

The word *became* seems to convey the idea that the Logos-nature underwent some transformation into a human soul (*Ψυχή*) fitted for the new material organism, but the inference is not necessary : probably the perplexities of later and of modern thinkers concerning two natures and their union, a consciousness at once finite and infinite, a form of being at once human and divine, did not exist for the author: the

Gnostics with their hateful separation of the Logos from the man Jesus were alone before his eye.

*And dwelt among us.*—The rendering *tabernacled* brings out the analogy contained in the verse: as Jehovah once for a time dwelt among his people in the symbol of the ark and its cherubim within the tabernacle in which the Shekina or heavenly splendour was proof of a mystic but real presence (Ex. xxv. 8; xl. 34), so now the Logos, God's only-begotten, whose permanent abiding-place is heaven, tented for a time in the flesh, and manifested therein and therefrom *his glory*. The *glory* was, in the Old Testament, the luminous, cloud-like splendour which was the token of the presence of Jehovah: so also in the new; Lk. ii. 9; Acts vii. 55; angels, dwellers in heaven such as Moses and Elias, have it in smaller measure, as a reflected brilliancy. Since in this Gospel the Logos is a divine being, his *glory* is like that of God; but the conception is here spiritualised, as often in the Pauline writings; the *glory* is no phenomenon visible to sense, but is the divine splendour of the incarnate person as a full embodiment of life and light, manifested in his presence, words, and deeds. Since this glory is spiritually, not sensuously, apprehended, it is manifest only to believers; therefore the phrase *we behold* includes not eye-witnesses alone, but later disciples.

*As of the only begotten from the Father.*—The word *as* (ὡς) does not mean "like"; there is no comparison; it signifies "such as belongs to." The word *μονογενής* (*only begotten*) is used also in v. 18; iii. 16, 18; 1 John iv. 9 in reference to the Logos or Christ; in Heb. xi. 17; Lk. vii. 12; viii. 42; ix. 38 it means also "only-born" or "only" (child); in the Johannine writings it is used to discriminate the Logos or Christ from men and all other beings; men may *become children* (τέκνα), the Logos *is* by nature *only* or *only-begotten* Son (υἱός); see comment on v. 12. The construction is pregnant here; the phrase *from the Father* does not modify the

word *begotten*, but an implied participle "having come"; this is shown by the use of the preposition *παρά* ("from beside"): the only Son of God, who came from beside the Father and tented in flesh among us, displayed a glory as unique as his nature. The word *μονογενής*, not employed by Philo, who prefers *πρωτόγονος* (first-born) in his description of the Logos, was much used by the early Gnostics; Cerinthus and the Nicolaïtans regarded the æon Monogenes as father of Logos; Valentinus gave him an inferior position; it is therefore at least probable that the author wished to present Christ as the true Monogenes in opposition to Gnostic fancies; this is the more probable as the words *grace* and *truth* were also names of Gnostic æons; they are the first two female æons of the Valentinian syzygies; nowhere in the Gospel save in this prologue is the word *grace* (*χάρις*) used; the author evidently wished to show that the divine qualities and potencies, which the Gnostics distributed among many æons, were all embraced in the one Logos; and desired also to give these terms a distinctive Christian significance; here *grace* corresponds to *life*, and *truth* to *light* (v. 4).

*John beareth witness of him (v. 15).*—Of this spiritual glory of the incarnate Logos the first important witness was, and therefore logically still is, John the Baptist. The verse contains two thoughts: (a) that the visible Jesus is the very person whom John had announced as to come; therefore the words: *this was he of whom I said*; (b) this one who *cometh after me* (in time) has come to be *before me* (in rank): this greater glory and higher rank among men is now grounded upon the pre-existence of the Logos: *for he was before me*.

This is the author's summary of the significance of the mission of John; see, for its apologetic purpose, the Introduction §4, and i. 6-8, comment. This verse, as vv. 6-8, appears like an insertion; since v. 16 is best connected with v. 14.



*For of his fulness we all received (v. 16).*—The clause either (a) contains the ground of John's testimony : since we all received grace, John being included was thereby enabled to become a witness ; or (b) if v. 15 is insertion, the clause contains a proof of the assertion that the incarnate Logos was full of grace and truth : the fact that we *all* received is proof of the Logos-fulness.

The *fulness* is here to be connected with v. 14 ; it is a *fulness* of *grace* and *truth*. The word itself (πλήρωμα) had already become current among Christians (see Col. i. 19 ; ii. 9 ; Eph. i. 23 ; iii. 19 ; iv. 13) ; and in Gnostic circles, where it denoted "the totality of the primal powers included in the divine being" (see Cone, Vol. III of this series, on Col. i. 19). It is therefore probable that in his use of the word here the author would express his conviction that the fulness of divine potencies which the Gnostics found only in many æons is to be found in the one Logos incarnate. To Philo also the Logos is full of grace, as is God ; the peculiar phraseology of these verses 14, 16 is found in his writings (*Dreams*, I. 11 ; II. 27 ; *Posterity of Cain*, 43).

*Grace for grace.*—The preposition ἀντί here signifies "in addition to," "upon" ; this peculiar use is found in *Posterity of Cain*, 43, mentioned above : God gives *new* gifts, not so much "instead of" as "in addition to" the *old*.

*For the law was given by Moses (v. 17).*—The verse contains further proof of the glory of the incarnate Logos (v. 14) in the form of an antithesis, which includes three elements : (a) *grace and truth* are superior to *the law*, since they confer salvation ; (b) the incarnate Logos, Jesus Christ, is superior to Moses ; (c) that which comes into being and manifestation in a person is of a higher order than that which is simply annunciatory and non-personal. There is here only relative inferiority for Moses and the law, not rejection ; the use of the word ἐδόθη (*was given*) carries the implication that God was the giver of the law ; therefore the verse is as polemic

against the Gnostic rejection of the Old Testament as against the Jewish claim of its finality

*No man hath seen God at any time (v. 18).*—This concluding verse gives us as a summary : (a) the need of a revelation of God, since he is invisible ; (b) the adequacy of the person of the mediating revealer, since he is an only-begotten divine being, with God in the beginning and now after the incarnation in his bosom ; (c) the adequacy of his function as revealer ; he *hath declared* the Father, since even in his enfleshment he was so resplendent of the divine glory that whosoever by faith beheld him beheld the Father (xiv. 9). The marginal reading: *God* instead of *Son*, is best attested, and has in its favour the fact that the word *Son* is rather to be expected here because of the proximity of the words *only-begotten* and *Father* ; copyists would be tempted to substitute the word *Son*. The meaning is the same, whatever the decision ; for the Logos is in v. 1 called *θεός* (a divine being, see i. 1, comment) and in v. 14 designated *μονογενής* (only-begotten, see i. 14, comment) ; the verse clearly distinguishes, as does v. 1, the derived divinity from the Undeived One. The phrase *which is in the bosom of the Father* refers to the post-incarnate life of the Logos ; the figure is of the son returned home and in the embrace of the father ; the cycle is completed ; the Logos is and will be, as he was in the beginning, *with God* (v. 1).

#### Part I. Jesus the heavenly Prophet, i. 19-xii. 50.

Jesus, the Logos incarnate, appears among men in the function of prophet. Greater than John, than Elijah, than Moses, he shows his marvellous power by stupendous miracles in Galilee and Judea ; having the words of eternal life, he utters high and mystic truths beyond the comprehension of Jews, Samaritans, a Nicodemus, even his own disciples ; at last the children of those who stoned the ancient prophets reject him and his message, and plot his death.

John the Baptist as witness to Jesus as the Son of God. i. 19-34.

The total significance of John has already been given in

principle in i. 7-8. It is now to be given in illustrative narrative.

*The Jews* (v. 19).—This word, which often in this Gospel denotes the nation in its anti-Christian totality as antithesis to the people of God, has here the specific significance of the ecclesiastical head, the Sanhedrin, whose instruments are the *priests and Levites*.

The answer of John, made emphatic by the phrase "*confessed and denied not*" (v. 20), is of the nature of anticlimax. John is conscious that he is neither the *Christ*, the great Messiah, nor *Elijah* (v. 21), who was expected as a forerunner of Messiah or of Jehovah's day (Mal. iii. 23); nor even the (unknown) *prophet* of Deut. xviii. 15; but he is only the *voice of one crying in the wilderness*, the witness, the herald of whom a prophet spake (Is. xl. 3); himself no directive personality, but ancillary. (For the contrary, see Matt. iii. 3; Mk. i. 3; Lk. iii. 4.)

*I baptise with water* (v. 26); the marginal translation is to be preferred; water is the element *in* which John (and the old religion, as in ii. 1-12) moves, and which is the true symbol of his activity. There is here no expressed contrast with the baptism of the Spirit as in the Synoptics, for Jesus is himself Spirit; but baptism is justified, because Messiah, *whom ye know not*, is already present. On the expression *he that cometh after me* (v. 27) see above, on v. 15.

*Bethany* (v. 28) is here definitely fixed as beyond Jordan, conceived as in Perea. The readings Bethabara and Betharaba have some support; all three are probably variants of Beth-nimrah, an oasis in the Jordan valley, 13½ miles east of the river.

*On the morrow* (v. 29).—The phrase is, as in vv. 35, 43, rather an indication of disjunction in the matters contained than of chronological succession; there are three "*morrrows*" (a favourite grouping), and in each appears a distinct type of testification; see vv. 34, 41, 49.

*The Lamb of God*: the Lamb is a Johannine symbol, see Rev. v. 8; vii. 14; xii. 11. The conception is from the Old Testament; where the lamb appears (a) as the Paschal offering, Ex. xi.; (b) as an atoning burnt-offering, Ex. xxix. 38-41; (c) as a symbol or description of Jehovah's servant, Is. liii. 7; who suffers for the sins of his people. Since ὁ ἀιρων is also ambiguous, sometimes denoting "to bear," sometimes, especially by this author, "to take away"; since the expression is shown by the article ὁ to be a familiar one; since the widest cosmic significance is here attached to the work of this divine Lamb, in that it is the sin of *the world* which he carries off; since the Johannine theology is latest and synthetic;—it is probable that all three Old Testament ideas are combined in this one phrase. The national point of view of the historical Baptist is here abandoned for the widest universalism.

On v. 30 see comment, vv. 15, 27.

*And I knew him not* (v. 31).—The word *knew* here denotes to "comprehend," or "apprehend the significance of," therefore furnishes no evidence concerning a previous acquaintance or relationship.

In the remainder of the verse the whole significance of the Baptist's activity is declared to be preparatory to the manifestation of Jesus. There is no mention of the baptism of Jesus; as a divinity, as himself Spirit, he needs it not; it has no significance; even in Matt. iii. 15 it had become an empty, deceptive form.

In vv. 32, 33 there is use of Synoptic material; see Mk. i. 9-11; Lk. iii. 21, 22; the descent of the Spirit is simply a sign for *John*: instead of a voice to Jesus there is a preparatory one to the Baptist.

*This is the Son of God* (v. 34).—This phrase is used in the Synoptics as a designation of Messiah, in this Gospel it appears in Messianic confessions and declarations, but

with the added conception of transcendent origin and pre-existence.

The section vv. 29-34 is in part only the counterpart of, or parallel to, the Synoptic narrative of the baptism, since the actual event is not presented, since the independent significance of John's activity is not recognised, but the whole is made preparatory to the appearance of Christ, a preparation in the narrow and exclusive sense of testimony or witness. John is here no prophetic reformer, profoundly affecting the popular morals; he is only a voice which bears testimony.

The beginning of prophetic activity; the call to discipleship; transfer from John to Jesus; i. 35-51.

The calling of the first disciples is here put into immediate relation with John, who himself furthers it by his testimony: v. 36 is thus historical illustration of the assertion iii. 30, *He must increase, but I must decrease*. The actual result immediately follows the testimony; vv. 29, 34, 36. This section is thus parallel to Mk. i. 16-20; but the forty day fast and temptation is excluded by i. 29, 35, 43; II. 1.

This is the Johannine equivalent for the Synoptic narrative and is not to be regarded as a first call in Perea, preparatory to that mentioned in Mk. i. 16-20; since the word "follow" (*ἀκολουθεῖω*) in i. 37, 43 and Mk. i. 18 has evidently the same meaning, denotes a permanent and steady accompanying, since already *on the third day* (ii. 2) Jesus has a body of disciples who have followed him to Galilee.

Characteristic of the Gospel is the fact that, as John, the persons here called to discipleship at once recognise Jesus as Messiah; see vv. 41, 45, 49, and general introduction, § 3.

*Again on the morrow* (v. 35).—The word *again* refers to v. 29. Jesus remains in the vicinity; see v. 43; while in Mark (i. 12) he departs immediately after the baptism.

*Two of his disciples*: one is named as Andrew in v. 40; the other is an unnamed disciple, who here precedes Peter in discipleship (see v. 42) as in xx. 4 he arrives before him at the tomb. See Introduction, § 7.

On the phrase *Lamb of God* (v. 36) see comment on v. 29.

*They abode with him that day* (v. 39).—The word *abide* is probably here of double sense, after the Johannine manner ; in the first instance used literally, in the second it signifies the most complete spiritual unity. *That day* the accord of soul began and was perfected. The true disciple saw at once the verity of John's words, "Behold ! the Lamb."

The *tenth hour* is, according to the usual reckoning, four P.M. Wescott's endeavour (see his note on xix. 14) to establish the use of the Roman civil method of reckoning in this Gospel, and thus make the time of the interview 10 A. M. is unsuccessful. But there is *no necessity* to regard the phrase as denoting the hour when they met Jesus, it may signify the hour of parting ; while the word *hour* may here be used in the allegorical sense (Holtzmann) to denote the time precedent to the crucifixion and the giving of the Spirit ; in 1 John ii. 18 the Christian age appears as the *last hour*. Many find here accurate personal reminiscence.

*He findeth first his own brother* (v. 41).—Peter appears as the first-fruits of missionary endeavour, is therefore later in time than, if superior in fame to, the unnamed disciple of vv. 37, 40.

*Thou shalt be called Cephas* (v. 42).—While in Mk. iii. 16, Matt. xvi. 18 the name is bestowed apparently after long acquaintance, here it is at once given by him who knows man, ii. 25.

*Philip* (v. 43).—In the lists of the apostles Philip appears as fifth ; he is further mentioned in vi. 5, 7 ; xii. 21, 22 ; xiv. 8, 9 ; some features of the representation in this Gospel resemble the picture of Philip the evangelist in the book of Acts ; by the end of the second century the confusion was complete.

*Nathanael* (v. 45).—The name does not appear in the list of the apostles or elsewhere in the Synoptics ; it has a meaning (Gift of God) similar to that of Matthew, is therefore regarded by many as another designation for Matthew ;

others identify Nathanael and Bartholomew, since Philip and Bartholomew are coupled in Mk. iii. 18. According to xxi. 2 he was from Cana in Galilee.

On the phrase *the Son of Joseph* see vi. 42, comment.

In vv. 46-50 is portrayed the power of Jesus to overcome prejudice and compel immediate belief in his Messiahship from those who receive him, i. 12; here the supernatural knowledge of Jesus (v. 50) is the chief cause or means of faith. Nathanael is an idealised believer, perhaps a simple ideal of guileless manhood.

*Ye shall see the heaven opened* (v. 51).—Since in the Johannine description of the life of Jesus there are no literal fulfilments of this verse, it is to be understood (as in the Old Test., Gen. xxviii. 10-17; Is. lxiv. 1; or in Acts vii. 56) as a figure or symbol of the nearness of God, the actuality of divine communion. The plural number (*ye*) shows how little heed was given to historical pertinency: it is the confession and experience of the whole body of believers: they spiritually beheld the union of Jesus with God.

The two-fold *Amen* is characteristic, occurs 25 times, is confined to sayings of Jesus; the single Amen is found in the Synoptics; the Johannine use indicates more solemn and weighty import.

This mention of *angels* is the sole instance in the Gospel and Epistles of John.

*Son of man*.—The phrase in the Old Test. (Ben Adam) usually denotes simply a human being; in Ezekiel it is a self-designation wherein is contained both the ideas of the lowliness of the prophet as person and the exalted nature of his commission; it is probable that Jesus used it in a similar way. In the Synoptics it is usually a synonym of Messiah, whether conceived as normal, ideal, man or as an angelic being similar to man.

In the fourth Gospel the "Son of man" is a being neither simply man, nor like man save in appearance, nor like

angels, but similar in nature to God (god, θεός, i. 1), not to be identified with God (ὁ θεός), but pre-existent, super-angelic (as Heb. i. 7-14); coming from heaven (iii. 13), he is to return—be lifted up—when he shall have given to men the life and light which are in him, which constitute his nature.

See also comment on iii. 13, 14; vi. 27, 53, 62.

The “greater things” (i. 50) are now to be displayed to the disciples. The external form is the seven signs (see Introduction, § 2). The inner substance is the truths of the discourses which accompany these signs, and are connected with them in such a way that they are comment or elucidation, while the “signs” are never simple wonders but are also symbolic deeds, act-allegories, which obtain their importance from the idea, not the phenomenon.

Jesus turns water into wine; ii. 1-11.

Jesus as the giver of grace and joy in their fulness here shows his superiority to the old religion and its representative John. At the feast (John is ascetic) Jesus creates new wine from the old water of the law to replace the poor and failing wine of the feast. The old religion had wine; it was inferior and scanty. When it has failed, at the end of the feast, Jesus, as the true but not recognised bridegroom, furnishes a wine which, though it is from the old water of the law, is yet a new and divine creation. By the enigmatic and ambiguous saying of v. 4: *my hour is not yet come*, this wine of the wedding is brought into relation with the death of Jesus; the rich wine of his spilled blood is the sustenance of the believer at the Gospel banquet.

*The third day* (ii. 1) is reckoned from i. 46; the sixth from i. 19-28. *Cana of Galilee* is thus called to distinguish it from a more northerly city of the same name; Josh. xix. 28. Tradition located it about three and one-half miles north-east of Nazareth; later geographers find it nine miles north. The name denotes “possession” or “procuring”; is fitting for a place where the fulness of power or a miracle of creative energy is displayed. *The mother of Jesus* is of course Mary; but never in this Gospel is she mentioned by



name. She appears at the beginning and close of the public life of Jesus (ii. 1, 3, 5, 12; xix. 25-27). While in the Synoptic narrative (Mk. iii. 31-35) the mother is seen among the incredulous family at the beginning of Jesus' ministry, here she is at once both nearer to him and farther away; nearer, since she in faith expects a miracle (vv. 3, 5) though none has as yet been performed (v. 11); farther away, since in his Logos-nature he belongs to a higher order, so that she is only woman (v. 4), and may not know his mind (v. 5). The explanation of this feature lies in the fact that the earthly relation is insignificant; the mother of Jesus is representative and symbolic; she is the old religion, from which the new proceeds, historically related, yet of another nature, at once united and separated.

*They have no wine* (v. 3).—The mother turns, with a consciousness or presentiment of miraculous power, to the son: the old religion confesses its need, and turns with a prophetic hope to the new.

*Woman, what have I to do with thee?* (v. 4).—For Old Test. and New Test. parallels see Josh. xxii. 24; Judges xi. 12; Mk. i. 24; Matt. viii. 29. The expression denotes, as Meyer concedes, a "rejection of fellowship"; or implies as in Mk. i. 24 the widest difference of nature. The word *woman*, which from the view-point of family life is unexpected, formal, distant, is suitable to the narrative as a symbolic antithesis of the old and the new; since it clearly expresses the lower nature of the Jewish religion over against that whose founder is the divine Logos. But many regard the word as used in reference to the activity of Jesus; as regards his Messianic activity Mary is not mother, but one woman among others. Beza and Calvin saw here a prohibition of Mariolatry. The *hour* means here apparently the time for a miraculous manifestation of Messianic power; this is however in opposition to the speedily following miracle; one must therefore either suppose an immediate

change in the purpose of Jesus, as do those commentators who regard the narrative as fact ; or, preferably, take the word in its frequent Johannine meaning of the *hour of death*, when first the real glorification begins and the Spirit is given ; thus from the beginning the death-hour lies clearly before the vision ; see vii. 30 ; viii. 20 ; xii. 23 ; xiii. 1 ; xvii. 1.

*Six waterpots of stone, containing two or three firkins apiece (v. 6).*—The number and size of the vessels—the firkin, *μετρητής*, contained about 9 gallons, and the whole amount of water would therefore measure 100–160 gallons—is given in order to magnify the *fulness* of the grace conferred by Jesus. To the same cause is to be attributed the statement in v. 7, *that they filled them up to the brim*.

*Draw out now (v. 8).*—Westcott (and Abbott in *Enc. Bib.* : “Gospels”) regards the command as one to draw *from the well*, as the more usual significance of *ἀντλέω*: when enough had been drawn for purposes of purification, the water *in the well* became a never-failing fountain of wine. Though this accords with iv. 10, 14, it has against it the evident intent of vv. 6–7; guests would not expect wine from a well.

The purpose of vv. 9–10 is simply to indicate the actuality of the change and the resultant quality of the wine.

*When men have drunk freely (v. 10)* is too weak ; the words in Greek mean “when they have become intoxicated” ; they cannot then discriminate good wine from poor.

*His signs (v. 11)* begin with this miracle of omnipotence and end with the raising of Lazarus ; they manifest the glory of the Logos-Christ (see comment on i. 14) ; they are therefore tokens of the higher nature of the Johannine Son of God, and are so understood by those who have this higher faith, as they are also means of certification ; the *disciples believed*, the world knew not the significance, to it the miracle was no *sign*.

Over against the Synoptic unpretentious beginning of miracles in the cure of a demoniac at Capernaum (Mk. i. 21-28, Lk. iv. 31-37) this act of creative power presents a striking contrast. Among those who hold to the substantial historicity of the narrative, the attempts to construe the event so as to bring it into nearer accord with the natural and intelligible are many. From Augustine to Olshausen the wine has been regarded as produced by a natural process miraculously accelerated; others regard the water as becoming no real wine, but assuming the colour and taste of the beverage; others make the miracle psychological, wrought upon the guests, since the water remained such, but the gustatory organs were affected as if by wine; others suggest that we have here simply the innocent conjurer's trick of a wedding feast. Weiss hints at a "transformed tradition"; Wendt (*"das Johevglm,"* 221-2) believes it possible that a saying of the Apostle John concerning the superiority of the Gospel over the law as wine excels water became, among the disciples of the apostle, a narrative of an external fact.

But while some historical fact may have furnished suggestion, there are many reasons for regarding the section in its present form as allegory or spiritual representation. The Synoptic account does not contain it, though the disciples are here said to be present, and it is difficult to believe that such an event could have found no place in the earliest tradition; it is at best a luxury-miracle, without sufficient occasion, since wine could easily have been obtained elsewhere; from the ethical standpoint the transaction is with difficulty defended, since the true interpretation of v. 10 (see comment) makes the miracle subserve a continuance of drunkenness at the feast; the quantity of wine produced (see comment on v. 6) is out of relation to the need; the feature of Jesus' reply to the mother is unnatural if history, but intelligible if treated as allegory; the miracle itself is without parallel even among the Johannine signs.

Allegorical features are certainly present, and the whole narrative may be best understood as in the explanation given in the title of the section. The material for the allegory was readily furnished by the Synoptic tradition; the kingdom of God is a feast, Matt. viii. 11; disciples are wedding guests, Mk. ii. 19; Matt. ix. 15; Lk. v. 34; the Gospel is new wine, Mk. ii. 22; wine is the symbol of the festal joy in the coming kingdom, Mk. xiv. 25. So in Johannine symbolism Jesus is the true vine, the source of wine, John xv. 1. To this may be added the impulse from Alexandrian allegory: in Philo (*Allegories*

of *Sacred Laws*, iii. 26) the same figure is found : " But Melchisédek " (the ideal High Priest, prototype of the Logos) " shall bring forward wine instead of water, and shall give your souls to drink, and shall cheer them with unmixed wine."

Thus understood, the section becomes a noble tribute of early Christianity to its founder ; a recognition, Oriental in form, of the joy which had come through faith in him.

Jesus cleanses the temple at Jerusalem, ii. 12-25.

The superior dignity of Jesus as Messianic Son of God is now shown in his authoritative act of cleansing. The evangelist places in strong antithesis the old perishable corrupted Jewish temple over against the new, sanctified, spirit-filled temple, Jesus (see vv. 19-22), incapable of permanent dissolution, restored if momentarily destroyed. As the first sign : the water made wine, is a prefigurative representation of the coming fulness of life imparted to believers by the creative energy of the Logos-Christ, this act is an assertion of the same creative energy in the form of a prophecy of the self-resurrection of the truly imperishable temple ; see vv. 19-22.

Verse 12 is connective ; the mention of the *not many days* calls attention to the speedy oncoming of the Passover feast ; the *brethren* are brothers, members of the family of Joseph and Mary (see vii. 3, 5, 10) ; the disciples receive separate mention.

*In the temple* (v. 13) ; i. e., in the temple area the exchange business, which was a great convenience for worshippers, was improperly carried on in the court of the Gentiles.

*The changers of money* (v. 14) were necessary because the temple tax was paid in Jewish coin, which was not in general circulation ; the place, not the act, was unfitting.

*A scourge of cords* (v. 15) : probably made of the stems of bulrushes ; an emblem of authority rather than an instrument of actual chastisement ; in Rabbinic circles Messiah was depicted as armed with a scourge ; see also Zech. xiv. 21, Revised Version, margin.

*My Father's house* (v. 16) : spoken from the special Messianic consciousness, and the Johannine standpoint ; the Jews are no true people of God, and the temple not their house.

*The zeal of thine house* (v. 17): zeal *for* the house, objective Genitive. The quotation is from Ps. lxi. 9, where the verb represents a fact of the past and present; here the verse is made into a prophecy by a change of tense; the result is to be death; since the word *remembered* is, as in v. 22, to be understood of a subsequent reflective memory

*The Jews* (v. 18) now demand a sign, a supernatural deed as certification of Jesus' authority. The answer (v. 19) is entirely after the Johannine manner; a sentence of double or threefold meaning, misunderstood by the Jews, v. 20, and only later comprehended by the disciples. In the more evident sense, the temple is simply the structure; so the Jews understand the saying. But as the temple is the religious centre, there may lie in the saying the thought that should the Jews destroy, as they were doing by temple defilement, the true spiritual religion, Jesus would himself speedily restore it. A third is the sense given it by the evangelist, v. 22, in which the temple is the body of Jesus, the death and resurrection of whom are self-known from the beginning. The *three days*, v. 19, denote a short time; they were sometimes literally understood.

For Synoptic form of v. 19 see Mk. xiv. 58.

*Forty and six years* (v. 20) is approximately the time which elapsed between the commencement of temple enlargement by Herod the Great (20 B.C.) and the public ministry of Jesus. The structure was not completed until 6 $\frac{1}{2}$  A.D.

Verse 21 gives the evangelist's or disciples' later interpretation of v. 19; as v. 22 indicates. In the Pauline and post-Pauline theology the church has become the mystic body of Christ, which is connected with the Master by the rite of the Last Supper. The *scripture*, here not cited, may well have been Ps. xvi. 10.

The Synoptic record places the cleansing of the temple at the close of the public ministry of Jesus, the fourth Gospel at the beginning;

in the one it is the act of a reformer stirred by religious degeneracy, and is the chief cause of his speedy arrest and conviction; in the other it is programmatic and historically isolated, without sequence, an act of symbolic significance, in which the Logos-Messiah displays at the beginning of his public career his superiority over the existent religion, himself already fore-knowing the future as it embraces his own death and resurrection as well as the destruction of the temple. The preference must be given to the Synoptic position; it is as historically fitting as the Johannine is symbolically; there is no sufficient ground for the common belief that the event occurred twice.

Verses 23-25 contain the representation that although many in Jerusalem believed on Jesus he knew their belief to be imperfect and impotent against the hostility which is to end in his death; he who knows men's secret thoughts and traits (i. 42, 47) knows the future. The mention of indiscriminate miracles at this time, over against ii. 11 and iv. 54, where a first and second are distinctly designated, is both an indication that the author used a "Johannine" tradition, and an illustration of the post-apostolic tendency to magnify the miraculous.

Nicodemus and Jesus, iii. 1-21. A discourse on the kingdom of God; the capacitating condition for admittance is the new birth, vv. 3-9; the true object of faith is the heavenly Son of man, vv. 10-15; the true result is the reception and possession of the kingdom in its inner essence as life and light, vv. 16-21.

In this scene of representative significance *the teacher of Israel* (v. 10) faces the teacher who is *from God* (v. 2.) Nicodemus is the representative of learned Rabbism, desirous of salvation but in stupid superficiality incapable of receiving or comprehending spiritual truth; smitten into silence at the lofty words of the Son of man. The interview is not properly a dialogue; three times only does Nicodemus open his mouth: first, with the easy assurance of a vacuous half-faith (v. 2); then, with the query of a gross and fleshly interpretation born of ineptitude (v. 4); lastly with the stupid stare of utter inability to comprehend he cries out, "How can these things be?" (v. 9): thus he vanishes; the historical interest seeks to know the result of the interview, but it is given only in the

speedy overwhelming of the shallow teacher and the whole course of the section, where, as often, the discourse begins with misapprehension by the unspiritual, whose failure to understand is made hopeless by the utterance of more exalted spiritual conceptions (v. 12).

*Nicodemus* (iii. 1); the name means either "conqueror of the people," or if Semitic, "free from blood"; the person appears only in Johannine and late tradition, see vii. 50; xix. 39. The Talmudists often mention a Nicodemon ben Gorion, whose real name was Bani, a wealthy councillor in Jerusalem whose "special duty was to provide water for the pilgrims at the feasts." He lived just before the destruction of the city; and it is possible that he is really the same person as Joseph of Arimathea, and that tradition at length came to regard the names as those of two persons.

*Rabbi* (v. 2) is complimentary. The emphasis lies upon the word *teacher*; the phrase *we know* indicates the common opinion of the colleagues of Nicodemus; the fatal error of all is that they regard Jesus only as teacher. In the mouth of Nicodemus the words *from God* indicate commission, not origin; the last clause of the verse contains the same idea; this also is Rabbinic error to the evangelist, since to him to be "from God" denotes no simple authoritative activity in the service of God, but a coming forth of the person from some place or form of divine existence; see xiii. 3; xvi. 30. The reason given for this half-faith: the presence of "signs," places Nicodemus among the class mentioned in ii. 23 (see comm nt thereon).

*Except a man be born anew* (v. 3).—The reading of the margin *from above* is also to be considered. While but one meaning can be expressed in a translation, both are included in the total idea, since *ἄνωθεν* is here designedly used in a double sense. So far as the verse resembles Synoptic teaching, the word may be rendered *anew*; partial parallels are to be found in Matt. xviii. 3; Mk. x. 15; Lk. xviii. 17;

the expression corresponds to the idea set forth in the Synoptic noun and verb "repentance" and "repent"; which are fundamental in the Synoptics, but absent from this Gospel; in them the emphasis lies upon the renewal, which is ethical since it is at least in part an act of man, may therefore be demanded; Mk. i. 15. On the other hand, in the Alexandrine dualism, and in the mysticism of this book, it is a birth *from above*, having its source in heaven, a mystic happening in which man is passively determined from an upper world; a change not simply of momentary volition, but of the whole nature. Herein lies its connection with the preceding verse; it is at once an answer to the question implied in v. 2, and a staggering blow to the presumptuous self-assurance which lacks the first condition of heavenly citizenship.

This incapacity is now set forth in the question of Nicodemus (v. 4), who remains in bewilderment because of his unspiritual mind: such a physical process is impossible.

The answer of Jesus (v. 5) is a repetition of v. 3, save that it is made more explicit by the phrase "of water and the Spirit." Whether the "water" is to be here understood as physical fact or as symbol has long been disputed, as also whether, if baptism be meant by the words *from water*, it be the baptism of John or Christian baptism. Since the phrase of "water and the Spirit" is the equivalent of *ἄνωθεν* in v. 3; since here water is not in antithesis with Spirit, as in i. 26, 31, 33, see also Mk. i. 8, but is co-ordinated with it, see vii. 38, 1 John v. 6-8; since the form and thought are influenced by the author's time and theology; the preference is to be given to the literal interpretation; the word denotes baptism, which in the early church conditioned the gift of the Spirit and therefore also admittance into the kingdom.

*That which is born of the flesh is flesh* (v. 6).—The verse is proof of v. 5; the fruit is of the nature of the plant. Flesh



(σάρξ) is here (as in i. 13; 1 John ii. 16) used in an essentially Pauline sense as the antithesis of spirit (πνεῦμα); save that the difference is more radical; it is not only ethical, but principiant; the Alexandrine dualism here finds expression.

The mystery of the new birth and the new life is now reaffirmed in vv. 7, 8 by a new analogy in which the word πνεῦμα, which may denote either *wind* or *Spirit*, is made to convey the idea that this higher spiritual life is neither cognisable in its origin nor in its ultimate essence but only in its results.

The wide-mouthed stupidity of Nicodemus (see introduction to section iii. 1-21) is made the occasion of cutting reproof in vv. 10-12; the teacher of Israel cannot comprehend even these ideas, the spiritual realities which belong merely to the sphere of earth and human experience.

*We speak* (v. 11) is a plural clearly expressive of the common Christian consciousness; the last clause of the verse also plainly indicates that we really have here the late expression of the historical fact that the Jews (Rabbinism) rejected the witness of the church. But here it is used to express the peculiar self-consciousness of the pre-existent Son of God.

*Earthly things* (v. 12) are here put into contrast with *heavenly*. They are both spiritual, as parts of the teaching of Christ: the *earthly* are the anthropological, belong to the sphere of human activity and experience; the *heavenly* are the Christological, concern the nature and incarnation of the pre-existent Logos; these are now set forth in vv. 13-21. Catholic theologians find in the *heavenly things* the mystery of the Trinity.

The heavenly things of v. 12 are now described; and first the person of the Son of man, v. 13. The thought of the verse is this: such surety (v. 11) as this great teacher (over against the dumfounded Nicodemus) has, would in the

case of any other son of man be attained only by actual ascent into heaven ; but he who is the super-earthly, pre-existent, incarnate *Son of Man* and who has descended from his true home in heaven, can speak the eternal truth and bring the eternal life, i. 51, comment. Therefore the words *no man hath ascended into heaven* are not to be understood to mean simply spiritual exaltation, nor are they expressive of the (then future) Ascension.

The final clause, *which is in heaven*, is probably not genuine (being lacking in the Sinai and Vatican codices) ; ὁ ὢν, the present participle, is ambiguous, and may mean *he who was*, in which case it is tautological ; or *he who is*, in which case it refers to the Ascension.

To the *descent* of this Son of man is now put in antithesis his *exaltation*, the other aspect of his salvatory work (v. 14). The verb ὑψωθῆναι, *be lifted up*, is of double import, referring firstly to the crucifixion as a redemptive act comparable to the healing by means of the brazen serpent in the wilderness (see Numb. xxi. 6-9) ; but secondly to the Ascension, wherein the heavenly Son of man returns to his true home, from which, as Spirit, he sends the salvation-completing Spirit, so that (v. 15) *whosoever believeth may in him have eternal life*.

(On eternal life, see i. 4, comment ; vi. 40, 47).

This coming down from heaven and return are now in vv. 16, 17 set forth in their fundamental cause ; the love of God to the world. On the word *world* see comment i. 9 ; the gift of the Father is heightened by the fact that this is the *only-begotten Son* ; see comment on i. 18. The word *world* here embraces humanity ; the tenses used in the two verbs *perish* and *have* (ἀπολῆται, ἔχη) indicate that the former is momentary, the latter permanent ; in this both Holtzmann and Weiss agree.

In v. 17 the thought of the preceding verse is repeated ; *sent* corresponds to *gave*, to *judge* = to (cause to) *perish* ; to

*be saved* = *to have eternal life*. There is indeed a judgment, a condemnation, *κρίνω* is of double meaning here ; but this is incidental and instrumental ; the end, the ultimate aim, is salvation. Judgment, the exercise of judicial authority, was among Jews regarded as a chief function of Messiah, this is here denied ; salvation is the great end ; therefore there is only relative contradiction to ix. 39.

*He that believeth on him is not judged (v. 18).*—The verse is proof of v. 17. The Son's function is not ultimate judgment or separation, since this is accomplished already in principle if not in fact by the Incarnation ; he that believeth is not (to be) subjected to judicial processes (that *κρίνεται* is in the present tense with future meaning is shown by its antithesis in the perfect, *κέκριται*, *has been judged*) ; *he that believeth not* has already by his disbelief found a judgment which is condemnation, since in the coming of (the Logos-Christ as) light into the world (v. 19) *men* (in general) *have loved the darkness*, and thereby condemned themselves, so that it is true that they were not judicially condemned by the Messiah. The word "name" here denotes all the attributes, the whole personality of Messiah.

*And this is the judgment.*—The word *κρίσις* here signifies the process rather than the result of the discriminating activity. For the word *light* see comment on i. 4 ; it here includes the person of Jesus. The word *loved* indicates by its tense that we have here a reflection of the author upon the actual result ; *men*, the multitudes, had then turned away. The last clause : *for their deeds were evil*, gives the ground for these specific acts of rejection, which are now in vv. 20, 21 explained psychologically. As in the prologue, i. 5, 12, 13, the possession of the true knowledge which is the essence of salvation, xvii. 3, is conditioned by the ethical attitude of the individual ; thus the Johannine determinism is modified.

The third Gospel gives us (xviii. 18-24) the picture of a rich Jewish ruler who comes to Jesus to enquire the way of life, who becomes sorrowful at Jesus' teaching, and concerning whose choice we are not informed. The conditions of salvation there laid down contain no mention of belief in Jesus. The agreement with John iii. 1-21 in externals is less striking than the difference in the conditions of attaining or receiving eternal life. This section has well been said to contain in epitome the whole theology of the evangelist. The defects of the section as dialogue, the presence of no witness, the obscurity of the historical, the insertion of Messianic claims thus early in the public ministry, the presence of elements belonging to apostolic experience—all these are convincing indications that in the main the scene is ideal, and the conceptions are the fruit of apostolic experience and meditation. In drama whose motive is dogma and ecclesiasticism Jesus and Nicodemus stand over against each other as representatives of the spiritual and the fleshly mind. The proud Jewish ruler, a stranger to baptism and the gift of the Spirit, is wholly unable to comprehend the Christian mysteries, stumbles, blunders, slinks away unnoticed, while the Logos-Christ pours forth his heavenly words.

**The final witness of John Baptist to Jesus, iii. 22-36.**

The occasion is set forth in vv. 22-26.

*He baptised (v. 22).*—The verb indicates repeated action. In iv. 2 baptism by Jesus in person is denied. Verses 23, 24 represent the ministry of Jesus and John as for a time contemporaneous, see per contra, Mk. i. 14; Matt. iv. 12.

After iii. 5 it seems most natural to suppose that Christian baptism is here meant; this is favoured by the Messianic confessions of the disciples, i. 41, 49. The location of Ænon is unknown.

*With a Jew (v. 25)* may be a corruption of an original reading "with those of Jesus." The text is uncertain; there is no reason in the context for mention of a Jew; if the dispute were about lustrations in general, thus including baptism, it would occur more naturally between followers of John and those of Jesus.

*All men come to him* (v. 26) : the language of angry jealousy ; in it the failure of the Baptist movement finds expression.

The answer of John in vv. 27-36 is in its main features as follows : Every man has his lot determined by God, it is mine to be witness to Messiah, a friend of the bridegroom Jesus, in whose prosperity I rejoice ; he must increase for he is from above ; his witness is true ; sent of God, all things are given into his hand ; he gives life to believers ; wrath from God abides on the disobedient. The ideas of the later verses resemble those of the preceding section, vv. 12-21.

Verse 28 contains reference to i. 20, 27, 30.

The analogy of v. 29 is similar to that of Mk. ii. 19 ; the bride is here the new Christian church ; the joy of John is the joy of a friendly guest, himself brideless ; with no future save as he finds it in another's welfare. As in accordance with the thought of v. 30, the church established as the day of John's nativity, June 24th, when the days begin to shorten ; in the case of Jesus the converse was taken, Dec. 25th.

The reason of the increase of Jesus is now (v. 31) set forth : it is the heavenly nature of Messiah, here contrasted with the earthly nature of John. The phrase "*from above*" is the rendering of the Greek *ἄνωθεν* as in v. 3 ; the last clause of the verse repeats the idea ; the Johannine Christology is put into the mouth of John the Baptist.

*What he hath seen and heard* (v. 32) : the experiences of his pre-existent life in heaven with God. "*No man*" is spoken from the later standpoint of the evangelist, as "*all men*" (v. 26) from that of John ; both are relative, are hyperbole of the Orient, as the following verse shows. Since thus Jesus gives direct evidence from heaven, reception of the testimony is as a solemn seal in affirmation *that God is true* (v. ) 35 ; as rejection maketh God a liar, 1 John v. 10.

*For he whom God hath sent, etc.* (v. 34).—The proof that

we have in Jesus' teaching true words from God is here grounded upon the fact that Jesus is sent of God ; and in the last clause the proof that Jesus is sent of God is found in the fact that in the case of Jesus—the expression is general, but the application specific—the Spirit was given in its fulness, the proof of which lies in the fulness he bestows, i. 16.

The fulness of the Spirit is now (v. 35) set forth in its cause : the love of the Father to his Son as the only-begotten (see comment on i. 14) ; the tense (*hath given*) of the latter clause indicates that the giving was previous to the Incarnation, and thus its cause.

The result of this gift and the Incarnation is that the Son has appeared, and his presence has become the decisive criterion of faith and unbelief (v. 36) : *he who believeth hath eternal life* as a present possession or condition, v. 24 ; the result of the opposite attitude is a failure to receive the gift : since the present result of faith is set forth in the first clause, it seems fitting to regard the future tense "*will not see*" as also inclusive of present sequence and therefore not confine its application, as Meyer does, to the expected Messianic judgment ; as long as the unbelief continues its sequences remain ; *the wrath of God* (here alone in the Gospel) is the antithesis of eternal life, the divine displeasure against sin and sinners, manifested by darkness and ignorance ; this *abideth* : since men are by nature not in possession of life and light the wrath is already upon them ; it abides or continues unless it is set aside by faith in the Son.

Jesus in Samaria, iv. 1-42. He converses with a woman at Jacob's well concerning the true living water, vv. 8-17 ; concerning worship, vv. 18-24 ; announces himself as Messiah, vv. 25, 26 ; many Samaritans become disciples, vv. 27-42.

As Nicodemus is representative of Judea with its Rabbinic learning, and its spiritual incapacity, the woman at the well is representative of Samaria, its naiveté, its partial readiness to believe, its

greater receptivity. The farther one is from Jerusalem the greater the impressionability; iv. 45. The conversation includes a discourse on the living water, Jesus himself.

*When therefore the Lord knew*, etc. (iv. 1) : by his super-human knowledge, as i. 42, 48; ii. 25; xi. 11. The *Pharisees*, who in this Gospel are represented as officials resident in Jerusalem, are moved by the success of Jesus to active measures against him; but since his hour has not come (ii. 4), he eludes them by departing for Galilee.

*Although Jesus himself baptised not* (v. 2) : see comment on iii. 22. *Again* (v. 3) refers to the marriage feast, ii. 1-12.

*Sychar* (v. 5) is by most recent geographers identified with the modern Askar, a village about half a mile from Jacob's well. But Shechem is also near. On the *parcel of ground* see Gen. xxxiii. 18-20; xlviii. 22.

*And Jacob's well was there* (v. 6).—A well or pit 9 feet broad and 105 feet deep, situated  $1\frac{1}{2}$  miles east of Shechem (Nablus) and  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile from Askar (see comment on v. 5) is now shown to travellers as Jacob's well. The *πηγή* is properly and usually a spring, a basin supplied from a constant subterranean source, living water. But in vv. 11, 12 this "well" is called *φρέαρ*, which usually denotes a pit or cistern, a receptacle for surface water.

*The sixth hour* is either noon or six P. M., probably the former.

The last sentence of v. 9 is either interpolation (it is wanting in the Sinai and Bezae codices,) or the evangelist's explanation. The alienation was centuries old. The verb *συνχρῶνται* is better rendered "have no friendly intercourse."

The answer of Jesus in v. 10 is no reply to the woman's question, but is entirely in the Johannine vein. The emphasis, as the structure of the Greek shows, lies upon the words "thou knewest," "who," "thou," "living water."

To *know* the Logos-Christ is eternal life, xvii. 3. If the woman only *knew*, the situation were reversed ; *she* would have hastened to ask instead of being asked ; he would have given her *living water*, *i. e.*, eternal life, the *gift of God*, while she can only offer material stagnant water from a cistern (see comment on v. 6). Living water is an Old Testament figure for spiritual good ; Jer. i. 13 ; xvii. 13 ; Zech. xiv. 8.

*Thou hast nothing to draw with* (v. 11).—The stupid answer of the woman shows that she (as Nicodemus, iii. 4, and even the disciples, ii. 20 ; xiii. 36 ; xiv. 5) understands in an unspiritual way the enigmatic saying of Jesus, who has neither bucket nor rope, is therefore presumptuous and foolish in offering her water from the well. But the evangelist makes even the woman use the expression in a double sense when in the following verse (12) she asks with scorn whether he is greater than the patriarch Jacob ; for the question would have no pertinency if she simply thought that Jesus would offer her the same water as Jacob drank ; because he presumes to offer something superior is he to be despised.

*Every one that drinketh . . . eternal life* (vv. 13, 14).—Jesus makes no direct reply to the woman's question, but continues the thought of v. 10 with the emphatic mention of one quality of the living water : it *quenches* the soul's *thirst for ever*. This, in the manner of the evangelist, is stated negatively, then positively. The *water* is first of all, as medium, Christ's word, which is really in essence himself, as he is the Word ; then since it is a vitalising principle *in him*, it becomes, as sequence for the believer, *eternal life*, the whole *present* result of all the spiritual forces active within the soul.

The purblind woman still remains unable to see beyond the literal meaning of the word water, as is shown by the clause :

*Neither come all the way hither to draw* (v. 15).



But she apparently conceives it as having some marvellous thirst-quenching quality.

Since Jesus fails to quicken her spirit to intelligence he determines to arouse her by a display of miraculous power; therefore he says:

*Go, call thy husband (v. 16).*—The command was not seriously given (as Luthardt agrees) if Jesus knew she had no husband; nor is there any evidence either in this feature of the conversation or its result that the purpose of Jesus was to awaken faith through an appeal to conscience; he wished to impress her by superhuman knowledge, as i. 42; 48; ii. 25.

*Thou hast had five husbands (v. 18).*—Since according to the Talmud the Samaritan laws concerning divorce were rigorous, this statement is so extreme that many commentators such as the orthodox Hengstenberg and (doubtfully) Westcott have adhered to the position that in this verse at least the woman is representative of the country of Samaria and the five husbands are the five deities formerly worshipped by the Samaritans (2 Kings xvii. 24-42; Josephus, *Ant.*, ix., 14, 3) while the present paramour is the illegal Samaritan Jehovah-cultus. Since other verses of this section (see 35-38, 42, and remarks after v. 42) evidently refer to the actual fortunes of Christian missionaries in the apostolic age, this interpretation is very probable; but since there is force in the objection that the evangelist would not represent Jehovah as a paramour even if the worship were illegal, there is worth in the suggestion of Holtzmann that the paramour is Simon Magus whom according to Justin (*Apology*, i., 26) almost all the Samaritans confessed and worshipped as "the first God." Certainly in Acts viii. 8-24 the mission in Samaria finds Simon accepted by the Samaritans as a deity.

*Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet (v. 19).*—The power to read her past history—Lange imagines lines in the face

resultant from each of the five matrimonial experiences—which the stranger displays is for the woman proof that he is a *prophet*; the word does not indicate in her mouth more than the ability to penetrate mysteries; farther than this her faith does not go; see comment on v. 29. There is no indication that her conscience is touched; if Jesus intended a conversation upon her past, she deftly and successfully turns this aside by the problem of the following verse.

*This mountain* (v. 20) is Gerizim, a limestone elevation south of the valley, and on which the seceding or rejected Samaritans had in the olden time erected a temple for Jehovah-worship, destroyed 129 B.C.

The Talmud contains mention of controversies at the foot of Gerizim between Samaritans and Jews concerning the merits of "this mountain and Jerusalem" as places of religious worship (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*, John iv. 20).

*The hour cometh* (v. 21).—The hour, in John, often denotes the Messianic era; the verb is future in significance; the conversion of the Samaritans—partially accomplished at the writer's time—is prophesied in the phrase: *shall ye worship the Father*. The *Father* designates the true object of worship under the more complete Christian revelation; the Jehovah-worship is connected with a vague defective idea of Deity, as v. 22 asserts. This verse, which departs from the wider universalism of vv. 21, 23, 24, and may well have come from such a discussion as that just mentioned (v. 20), asserts the inferiority of the Samaritan religion; in the phrase *we worship* Jesus identifies himself with the Jews: most commentators find the ground of the religious inferiority in the Samaritan rejection of the prophetic canon; the acceptance of the prophecies of Messiah makes it historically true that *salvation is from the Jews*; thus the Gnostic rejection of the Old Test. religion is itself rejected.

To all localised and defective cultus is now, in v. 23, placed in clear antithesis the ideal Christian worship; its

object is the Father, its subjects are the *true* (*i. e.*, genuine) worshippers; *in spirit* stands over against *this mountain* and *Jerusalem* in v. 21, for as spiritual it is unfettered and delocalised; *in truth* denotes in conformity to the highest reality, in completion, perfection.

*God is a spirit* (v. 24).—The clause contains a reason for the affirmations of v. 23; since a spirit is free from the trammelling conditions of materiality true worship is everywhere possible. The Christian is emancipated.

The answer of the woman (v. 25) is to the effect that the expected Messiah will settle all such controversies; she must therefore have regarded the preceding words (21-24) as no final or authoritative utterance. On the declaration of v. 26 see introduction to i. 35-51, and general introduction § 3.

*They marvelled that he was speaking with a woman* (v. 27).—Jewish custom forbade Rabbis to converse publicly, especially upon questions of law, with women. The reason for the woman's hasty departure may be found in the sudden coming of the disciples or her desire to spread information or an uncertainty concerning the assertion of v. 26, whereon she wished the opinion of others. That the latter is the case appears from the following:

*Come, see a man*, etc. (v. 29).—This shows that she recognised Jesus as a prophet, see v. 19 and comment. In the subsequent interrogation the translation: *can this be the Christ?* is inadequate and misleading, though far less so than the authorised version; for the interrogative adverb *μήτι* indicates that a negative answer is in the mind: *this is not the Christ, is it?* This Westcott concedes but asserts that "hope bursts through." In this dubiety the woman vanishes from the scene.

In vv. 31-38 an incident and brief discourse are evidently inserted for the purpose of presenting an ideal of missionary zeal. On seeing the multitudes approach Jesus cannot even heed the pangs of hunger. His lofty saying (v. 32) is mis-

understood, as is frequently the case (iii. 4 ; iv. 10—11) even by disciples (ii. 22 ; xiv. 5 ; xvi. 18), but explained in v. 34, where the *work* given Messiah to do is that of self-revelation and proclamation, completed at the cross, xix. 30.

*Say not ye* (v. 35) is, preferably : *do you not say ?* ; the saying is a kind of proverb indicating roughly the interval between seedtime and harvest. The proverb indicates a perceptible lapse of time as usual, whether in material or spiritual processes ; here is an exception ; to-day the seed was sown, but the fields are already white unto harvest ; reference being here made to the present and approaching Samaritans. Others, however, regard the passage as referring to the specific date of the utterance ; it is *now* four months until harvest ; therefore they place the interview and incidents in December. But the author clearly depicts this as a summer scene ; and v. 45 is not so far removed in time from the events of ii. 13-25.

Simple as is the sense of the concluding verses, 36-38, their application is uncertain, their pertinency doubtful, their coherency difficult of establishment. Since v. 35 contains the assertion of an immediate harvest, which is actualised in vv. 40-42, it seems most natural to understand vv. 36-38 to refer to then present conditions ; Jesus is *he that reapeth*, v. 36, and the reapers of v. 38 are Jesus and his disciples ; while *he that soweth*, v. 36, and the *others* who *have laboured*, v. 38, must according to the dictum of v. 37 be such predecessors as Moses, the prophets, and John the Baptist. But this representation of Samaritan conversion as the ripe fruitage of non-Christian and pre-Christian influences is contrary to the context, especially v. 22 ; is especially negated by the emphatic antithesis : *I sent you*, of v. 38, where Jesus appears as the sower, and the previous sending forth of the apostles is asserted. Many therefore regard the verses as prophetic ; the *harvest* of v. 35 is the future conversion of the Samaritans ; *he that reapeth* is the Christian

missionary ; the *others who laboured* are either Jesus alone—on account of the emphatic *I* of v. 38—or Jesus, the prophets, and John. At any rate, the verses are inappropriate at this period in the life of Jesus, and Wendt (*Das Johcevglm.*, 156) can only retain them as genuine sayings by the hypothesis that they were in the source used by the evangelist, were there in their proper position among the latest utterances of Jesus, and are here displaced.

In vv. 39-42 the partial conversion of the Samaritans is set forth, and the two classes of believers discriminated: those who superficially adhere to the miracle-worker or prophet, and those genuine disciples whose faith, mediated through the word, reaches its culmination in belief in a Messiah who is a world-Saviour ; the phrase, as the belief, belongs to a time later than this incident.

The *two days* of v. 40 are in the *Teaching of the XII Apostles*, xi., 5, the limit of the time the apostle or prophet may remain in one place ; “ if he remain three days, he is a false prophet.”

The most striking characteristic of this section, vv. 1-42, is its pedagogic significance. Jesus is here the type and model of the missionary, the Christian prophet of the post-apostolic generation. He is weary but zealous ; he is ready to defy custom and prejudice if he may sow some seed thereby (vv. 9, 27) ; is shrewd in turning a simple request into an opportunity to present the most lofty themes (vv. 7-14) ; he is so absorbed that he even forgets hunger (vv. 31-34) ; he uses his gift of prophecy (vv. 17-19) ; he may not remain more than two days (v. 40, see comment) ; he secures faith in a Messiah who is a Saviour of the world (v. 42). So evident is this pedagogic purpose that the question of the historicity of the narrative is of secondary moment. There may well have been some genuine tradition as its basis ; there is certainly some evidence of acquaintance with the locality. The naturalness of the dialogue in some places is offset by unnatural features in others. But in fulfilling his purpose the author departs without scruple from the historical. There were fountains in Shechem and Askar so that no woman need come to Jacob's well ; wells are traditional meeting-places ; there were no witnesses to such

extended conversation ; a discussion on the relative merits of Jerusalem and Gerizim as centres of worship is as unnatural proposed by a woman as it would be natural among learned Rabbis (see comment on v. 20) ; he who uttered Matt. x. 5 had surely not recently come with his disciples from the enthusiasm of spiritual conquests in Samaria ; the display of omniscience or omnipotence to compel belief (vv. 17-19) and the early self-proclamation or acceptance as Messiah (v. 26) are Johannine characteristics whose baselessness is shown by the earlier Synoptic tradition ; words like vv. 34-38 show that the author built upon such Lucan tradition as Acts viii. 5-24 ; Lk. x. 30-37 ; xvii. 11-19 ; the wide universalism of vv. 21-24, though its germ is in the teachings of Jesus, is as truly at home in the later apostolic age as is in v. 47 the confession that Jesus is the Saviour of the whole Cosmos.

Tatian in his Diatessaron placed this section after chapter vi ; evidently because it seemed to him improbable that Messianic activity in Samaria should precede any ministry in Galilee.

#### The healing of the nobleman's son, iv. 43-54.

*Two days* (v. 43) ; see comment on v. 40.

*For Jesus himself testified*, etc. (v. 44).—The verse clearly states the reason why Jesus went on into Galilee instead of returning into Judea. The most natural interpretation therefore is that by the phrase : *his own country*, Judea is indicated ; and this conclusion is fortified by the reception mentioned in the following verse (45) where the verb *received* (ἐδέξαυτο) must signify “welcomed as a prophet” or “as Messiah,” since the reason for the reception by the Galileans is their *having seen all the things that he did in Jerusalem at the feast* ; the reference is to ii. 23 where a belief based on seeing signs is set forth ; this reception is therefore no friendly welcome of a fellow-countryman. The explanation of many (*e. g.*, Holtzmann) that Jesus went into Galilee *for repose and quiet*, because a prophet has no honour in his own country, cannot be maintained because (a) in v. 45, as we have just seen, ἐδέξαυτο denotes an honourable reception, (b) this reception is presented as the *expected result* of the maxim of v. 44 ; the words *so when* (ὅτε οὖν) can have

only this signification, otherwise an adversative phrase such as "but when" would have been used; (c) the Johannine Christ knows what is in men, is never deceived (ii. 24, 25, xiii. 11, and often), and the author would not here so manifestly oppose his own Christological ideal. It is true that in viii. 41, 52 Jesus is said to be from Galilee; but it is not there said to be his *πατρίς*. There is no certainty that Judean birth (Bethlehem) was in the author's thought; to him symbolism was uppermost, and to him Jesus was the spiritual child of Jerusalem, since "salvation is from the Jews." Worthy of note is Meyer's explanation that a prophet has *at first* no honour at home; when Jesus had won it abroad, the Galileans received him.

On *Cana* (v. 46) see comment on ii. 1.

*A certain nobleman*; the marginal reading is preferable; the man was an officer under Herod Antipas; whether Jew or Gentile is not stated (see note at conclusion of section).

Capernaum was some 15 miles from Cana.

*Except ye see signs and wonders*, etc. (v. 48).—The saying is in the plural, and is often regarded as applying to Galileans in general. It is a peculiar answer to an anxious father whose love for his son and faith in Jesus (as healer) have brought him from Capernaum. But, as elsewhere, *e. g.*, ii. 4, the persons are not really individuals but types. The faith of the father is defective because it demands *vision* of the miraculous; the emphasis lies upon the verb *see*; this is shown also by the use of the word *wonder* (*τέρας*), which appears here only, and denotes a startling visual phenomenon. The father is rebuked because he, like the other Galileans (v. 45), possesses a faith or half-faith grounded on vision of marvellous phenomena and not on reception of the (equally miraculous) word of Jesus; he should not have asked Jesus to come down, but have believed in the power of the life-giving word; when he does this his son is healed. The point of the narrative lies in the progress of the faith

from a basis of objective vision to the ready inward reception of a word ; see xx. 29. There is no condemnation of belief based on miracle ; but the miraculous word is better than the miraculous vision. Weiss regards the harsh saying as erroneously introduced here by the evangelist, who was not present.

*Go thy way* (v. 50).—The nobleman is put to the test, whether he will believe without seeing. The *man believed*, came into the ideal faith, as the Samaritans, iv. 42, and Thomas, xx. 29. Weiss regards the words *thy son liveth* as no command or prophecy, but only as an expression of the assurance Jesus felt that God, not he himself, would heal the lad ; but v. 54 contradicts this ; Jesus is the Word, and speaks the life-giving word.

*The seventh hour* (v. 52) is either 1 P.M. or 7 P.M. ; if the former, it is surely peculiar that the officer does not set out on his return until the next day. It is possible that *yesterday* might denote the part of the solar day before 6 P.M. to those who regarded a new day as commencing at sunset, but this is contrary to the usual Johannine usage. The point of the matter is that the word of Jesus became immediately operative.

*The second sign* (v. 54) : for the first see ii. 1-11.

The Synoptic healing at Capernaum, Matt. viii. 5-13 ; Lk. vii. 1-10, is so similar to this that the Johannine narrative must be regarded as a variant ; the details differ most widely from Luke's account, where the man does not come to Jesus, the patient is a servant, Jesus speaks no word or command of healing ; the cure is not stated as occurring in the very hour of the interview. The peculiar features of the Johannine account are characteristic of the Gospel : (a) while in the Synoptics the master (or father) is a foreigner and his faith is contrasted with the lesser faith or the unfaith of Israel, here the antithesis of Jew and Gentile and the reception of the latter are omitted as of no consequence for the later time, and in their stead we have the man of kingly rank, as in the Gospel in general the poor and lowly are less prominent than in the Synoptics : therefore (b) the person healed is a



son, not a mere servant ; (c) the surprise of Jesus is omitted, since the all-knowing Logos-Christ does not marvel ; (d) the apparently heartless rebuke is inserted to illustrate the contrast between the half-faith of vision and intuitive full trust in a life-giving word (see comment on v. 48) ; (e) the miracle is—for that age—heightedened by the insertion of a greater distance between the healer and the healed.

**Jesus the life-giving healer, v. 1-47.**

Jesus at Jerusalem heals on the Sabbath a chronic invalid, vv. 1-9, is accused of breaking the Sabbath law or causing its violation, vv. 10-18, asserts his mission from the Father to quicken the spiritually dead, 19-27, and the physically dead, vv. 28, 29, asserts that as life-giver he has witness from John, vv. 31-35, from his own works, v. 36, from the Father, v. 37 ; then accuses the Jews of refusal to accept this witness, vv. 38-47.

The life-giving power of Jesus, already manifest in iv. 46-54, now finds a supreme expression in the healing of one who is no youth but is an aged man long sick. The man is a type of needy and decrepit spiritual illness, especially of Jerusalem ; the incident is, like the signs in general, only introductory to a didactic section in which the Johannine Christology and its grounds are set forth.

*A feast (v. 1).*—Whether this was the Passover, Pentecost, Tabernacles, New Year, Dedication, or Purim cannot be determined. Since one Passover is mentioned in ii. 23, and another is represented in vi. 4 as near, and in v. 3 the sick lie under porches as if the weather were warm, it may well be that the evangelist thought of some summer or autumn feast. Many decide in favour of Purim.

*The sheep gate (v. 2)* was probably near the north-eastern angles of the ancient wall, Neh. iii. 1, 32. There is no Greek word meaning gate in the text ; the word *sheep* may be immediately joined with the next so as to read, *there is at Jerusalem the sheep-pool*. All efforts to locate it are as yet indecisive. The Fountain of the Virgin is intermittent (see v. 7). Uncertain also is the name ; some MSS. read Bethesda, others Bethzatha or Bethsaida ; the variants were caused by difficulty of identification and by allegorical tendencies, since, *e. g.*, Bethesda means “ house of mercy.”

The *five porches* are regarded by Pfleiderer as allegorical references to the five books of the law.

The latter part of v. 3 and the whole of v. 4 of the common version are rightly placed in the margin; they are wanting in *8. B. C. D.*, are legendary addition, yet are in part presupposed in v. 7.

*Thirty and eight years* (v. 5) is a peculiar feature the insertion of which is most readily explained by the hypothesis that the author, with his love of type and allegory, here makes the paralytic represent Israel, which lingered 38 years in the wilderness, shut out from the promised land because of disobedience.

The features of vv. 6-9 are characteristic: Jesus *knows* (as we see miraculous knowledge in ii. 23-25; iv. 18; xi. 14, etc.) that the man has been long sick; the healing media are insufficient for all (as in ii. 1-11 there is indeed wine but it is poor and scanty); there is no mention of faith in the recipient (so in iv. 46-54; ii. 1-11; ix. 1-7); the miraculous act is one of unmediated omnipotence; the command *take up thy bed* is for the purpose of showing the completeness of the cure; only one is healed from the multitude of invalids (otherwise in vi. 2 from Synoptic source), so that the deed is selective, while in the Synoptics either one only is present, as Mk. ii. 1-12, or many are healed, as Matt. iv. 24; viii. 16; xiv. 35, 36.

The day being a Sabbath, the accusation of breaking the law by carrying his couch is made against the man by the Jews, v. 10, who do not apparently know that he has been healed; nor does the man know the healer whom he has obeyed, v. 12.

*Sin no more* (v. 14).—The Greek means “continue to sin no more,” as if the long illness were caused by continued transgression as in the Synoptics, *e. g.*, Mk. ii. 5-10, but this relation of sin and physical evil is apparently denied in ix. 3.

The reason for informing the Jews who the healer was, is not given ; self-defence here appears ingratitude.

*My Father worketh even until now, and I work* (v. 17).—The defence which Jesus here makes of his activity on the Sabbath is not grounded, as in the Synoptics, on the supremacy of the interests of mankind or on the authority of the Son of man over the Sabbath, Mk. ii. 23–28, but on the relation existing between the Father and himself. The Jewish idea of the repose of Deity, Gen. ii. 1–3 ; Ex. xx. 11, on which was based the Mosaic Sabbath law, is here abandoned ; in its place we have the Alexandrine metaphysical conception of God as pure continuous activity. Thus Philo says : “ For God never ceases making something or other, it is the property of God to be creating

God never desists from creating something, but when he appears to do so he is only beginning the creation of something else, as being not only the Creator but also the Father of everything that exists.” Therefore, argues Philo, the true translation of Gen. ii. 2 is not “ he rested,” but “ he caused to rest” (*Alleg. of Sac. Laws*, i., 3, 7). Here, as in our passage, v. 17, Philo uses the word Father as the best religious designation for a being continuously and benevolently active. Thus the Jewish Sabbath law is in principle set aside.

The phrase *ὥς ἄρτι*, *even until now*, does not, as Luthardt asserts, point to a future cessation of divine salvatory activity ; it denotes the ceaseless natural order. The peculiar relation of the two activities is indicated by the personal pronouns, which have the emphasis ; “ *My Father worketh and I work.*” The activity of the Son is not simply that of the organ through which the divine activity reveals itself ; it is more than that ; each has a sphere of activity (see v. 19) ; the unity is not simply ethical. That this is the evangelist’s thought is shown by the following verse (18), where the Jews understand the assertion to be that of equality with

God, which the succeeding verse does not deny, but explains.

*The Son can do nothing of himself, etc. (v. 19).*—The thought of the essential equality and unity of the Son and the Father is here stated, first negatively, then positively. The use of the words Father and Son naturally conveys also the conception of a certain subordination or at least posteriority of the Son and his activity, since the imitated works of the Father must precede the imitative works of the Son : but this is not the free and therefore ethical loving imitation of the child ; the basis of the similarity of activity is transcendental, founded on the unique metaphysical oneness of Father and Son ; since the Son sees *all* that the Father does and by necessity of nature duplicates it. So in v. 20.

*For the Father loveth the Son (v. 20).*—The equality of action is now grounded upon the love-relation, which will endure no concealment ; iii. 35 ; xvii. 4. The phrase *greater works than these* refers to the following activities of vivifying the spiritually and physically dead, vv. 21-29, and of judgment, v. 30, as compared with such works as the healing of vv. 1-9. The phrase *that ye may marvel* indicates that the *greater works* were to be visible to the same persons as had seen the lesser ; therefore that the works were near and spiritual, not eschatological in character.

In consequence of this sameness of nature it follows that *As the Father raiseth the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son also quickeneth whom he will (v. 21).*

The present tense designates the *principle* of the action, not its *time*, which may be present, past, or future. The verb ζωοποιεῖ (quickeneth) means to “cause to live,” “give life.” This probably includes both physical and spiritual life in the first clause, while in the second, since the word ἐγείρει (raiseth) is omitted, the life-giving activity of the Son is conceived as spiritual : the actual resurrection has not yet taken place, therefore the Son cannot yet in this do as he sees the Father doing. This life-giving is therefore, as in

v. 24, a present activity. as the phrase *whom he will* designates it as spiritual, as do the preceding narratives of healing rather than of raising from the dead, and the final clause of v. 20, which indicates a present or near result.

*For neither doth the Father judge any man, etc. (v. 22).*—Since in the Logos is life and this life is, when manifested, the light of men (i. 4), and this light when it is come into the world becomes for men a principle of self-judgment (iii. 17-19, see comment), it follows that a second great Messianic function is judgment; and since this judgment is conditioned on the incoming of the Son, whom the Father sent into the world, it follows that thus the Father hath *given all judgment unto the Son*. This judgment has its determinative element, since the Son gives life to, and thus exempts from judgment, *whom he will*, v. 21. So the judgment is of the Son, yet is not the purpose of his sending; this is the paradox of iii. 17-19 and v. 22-27.

Since the transcendent functions of giving life and executing judgment are given to the Son, it follows as result, and is included in purpose, that all give to the Son honour equal to that rendered to the Father (v. 23).

In vv. 24-27 it is shown *how* the Son gives life. He speaketh the words, as he is himself the Word, and these words, since *they are spirit and life* (vi. 63), confer the present gift of eternal life upon the believing hearer. These verses repeat in substance the ideas of vv. 21-23; there is more emphasis upon the thought of the new life in its antithesis to the spiritual death which expresses the state of those who believe not; this eternal life is in the soul a transcendent principle which so changes its nature that the dissolving forces of death have no power over it.

In v. 25 the words *the dead* (the spiritually dead, as Mt. xi. 5; Lk. xv. 24; Eph. v. 14) do not mean *all* the dead, but those destined to life, as is shown by the limited

subject of the following verb, *they that hear* (οἱ ἀκούσαντες is the aorist, they who actually listened in faith).

Verse 26 repeats the thought of 21, has the same Christological feature of unity or equality of essence with the Father together with the idea of subordination (see comment on v. 21). Since the Son *has life in himself* as an abiding principle, he needs not to die, his death becomes an act of his free choice, x. 18; his own resurrection is no act of power from the Father, as in Paul, but one of self-vivification, x. 18; and he becomes the *resurrection* as he is the *life*, xi. 25.

*And he gave him authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of man* (v. 27).—According to Jewish expectation and the Synoptic teaching Messiah is or is to be judge; in this passage the phrase *Son of man* may have the Synoptic meaning; but see i. 51, comment.

In vv. 28-29 the psychical (and physical) resurrection and accompanying judgment are attributed to Christ. The argument is from the greater to the less: do not marvel at this present spiritual life-giving and judgment, for a greater is to come, the cosmic; if ye believe the greater there is no need to wonder at the less. That the subject *all that are in the tombs* denotes the physically dead is clear from the twofold issue: the resurrection *unto life* of those *that have done good*, and *unto judgment* of those *that have done evil*. The *hour* that *cometh* is apparently that of the Parousia the last day, xi. 24.

As to the judgment see comment on iii. 18, 19; v. 22.

This presentation of a future universal resurrection and judgment as effected by Christ can only with difficulty be harmonised with the teaching of vv. 21-27. It is perhaps most scientific to note the paradox and leave it thus. Holtzmann (*N. T. Theologie*, ii., 519) regards the passage as an accommodation to the conventional method of thought and speech; Wendt (*Lehre Jesu*, ii., 199, 575) holds that it is an interpolation by the later evangelist into a genuine Johannine "saying."

*I can of myself do nothing* (v. 30).—The verse contains a repetition of the thought of the Son's subordination (see v. 19); here the unity follows from hearing, as there from seeing, the Father, from which cause the Son's judgment is equal to that which would be rendered by the Father.

In vv. 31-47 there are added to the self-witness of vv. 19-30 the witness borne by the Father (v. 32), by John (v. 33-35), by works (v. 36), by the Father (v. 37), by the Old Testament (v. 39), by Moses (vv. 45-47). Interspersed with this appeal to witnesses are polemic thrusts at Jewish opponents and the tone is increasingly hostile. See remarks after v. 47.

*If I bear witness of myself, etc.* (v. 31).—This may be regarded as a statement echoed from an opponent's mouth, "You say, indeed, that if I bear witness," etc. But even if this is conceded, there are other witnesses. The contrary appears in viii. 14.

*It is another* (v. 32), *i. e.*, God: though many connect this verse with v. 33, therefore regard the reference as to John.

*Ye have sent unto John* (v. 33): see i. 19-27.

*But the witness which I receive is not from man* (v. 34).—In the Greek the word "I" is emphatic; the thought is that for Jesus himself testimony from a mere man (like John) is of no value; he has himself the witness from God; but John's witness is adduced (since they demand earthly witness) *in order* that they may be saved.

The *works* (v. 36) are not simply the "signs," but embrace the whole Messianic activity, may therefore be spoken of in the singular, iv. 34; xvii. 4; since the most important activity of Jesus is his self-proclamation, "words" and "works" are often identical in content.

The *witness* (v. 37) of the Father is the Old Test. scripture, which also is the chief content of the *word* (v. 38); although the latter may include other forms of revelation.

The proof of this failure to receive the true revelation of the Old Testament is that *whom he sent, him ye believe not*.

*Ye search the scriptures*, etc. (vv. 39, 40).—The scripture is here put into antithesis with Christ; “ye search the *scriptures*, ye will not come *to me*”; for *in him was life*, i. 4; 1 John v. 11; therefore scripture does not contain it, its function is to bear witness to him who is the life, xiv. 6; therefore *δοκεῖτε* must mean “you wrongly, vainly fancy”; as is also shown by the emphatic subject *ὁμεῖς*; “*you* think so, not *I*.” This is the post-apostolic use and estimate of the Old Testament in the controversy with Jews.

In vv. 41-44 the Jewish unbelief is traced to two causes: an absence of love of God and a love of human authority and glory.

*I receive not glory from men* (v. 41).—The word *glory* means here only human praise or fame, of lust after which his opponents might accuse Jesus because of his self-assertion in vv. 19-39.

Since the Jews have no indwelling love of God they will not receive one who comes in his name, *i. e.*, in his authority or command.

*If another shall come in his own name* (v. 43).—The word *another* (*ἄλλος*) stands here in sharp antithesis to the first word of the verse (*ἐγώ*); therefore it is reasonable to interpret that other as *the* great opponent, Antichrist (so Bousset); others think of false-Messiahs; Pfeiderer and Schmiedel [*Enc. Bib.*, ii., 2550] regard the passage as a definite allusion to the false Messiah, Bar-Cochba, of 132 A.D.; therefore find here an indication of the date of composition.

In vv. 45-47 there is a culmination of the polemic in the appeal to the witness of Moses; even he, your great law-giver, *in whom you trust, wrote of me*; you do not even believe him. The *writings* (v. 47) are the Pentateuch, of which common tradition made Moses the author. With



this sharp thrust ends the discourse, which has gradually changed from defence to attack.

The whole section, v. 1-47, is in its essential elements an intensification and heightening of Synoptic material. The healing, vv. 1-16, contains so many similarities with Mk. ii. 1-12 that Weiss, who regards this narrative as historical, suggests that John supplemented his defective memory by use of detail from Mark, where also (ii. 23-38) is found the charge of Sabbath-breaking. Later, indeed (Matt. xxi. 23-27), comes the question of authority.

In John the scene of the healing is Jerusalem, the storm-centre, the place where the antitheses culminate; the illness is lengthened; the cure unconditioned by faith; the authority is grounded upon the nature of the Son as equal with God; the problems have become those of post-apostolic Christology and Jewish controversy; there is defence and attack; the discourse begins with attack upon Jesus for breach of the law of Moses and ends with an attack upon Jews for utter disbelief in Moses.

Jesus as the Bread of Life, vi. 1-71. He feeds a multitude of five thousand with five loaves and two fishes, vv. 1-14; walks upon the sea of Galilee, vv. 15-21; discourses with the people in a synagogue of Capernaum upon himself as in his whole person the bread of life, vv. 22-51; upon his flesh as a sacramental gift, vv. 51-59; his words bring both faith and unbelief to crisis, vv. 60-71.

In this section the life-giving power of Jesus is set forth under another symbol: bread; for which purpose the incident of the feeding upon the lake is included both because in the Synoptic order it follows the feeding and because in its representation of the body of Jesus as free from the natural limitations of weight, movement, and locality, it is well fitted to lead on into the mystical teaching of the flesh of Jesus as food for the church.

The discourse passes from an accusation of a low, superficial, external half-faith onward to the true object of true faith, the heaven-descended Son of God who is the true spiritual food, vv. 22-40; this food is the person of the Messiah who gives himself, vv. 41-51; in his flesh and blood, as presented in the Lord's Supper, this gift of life is realised, vv. 52-60.

*After these things* (vi. I).—The connection is vague; one

expects immediate succession of events; but *these things* evidently refer to some events which are not inserted and which occurred in Capernaum, since this city is evidently the place from which *Jesus went away to the other side of the sea of Galilee*. This inference is also favoured by mention of the multitude and miracles in the following verse. The connection is therefore taken from the narrative of Mark vi. The lake of Galilee was called by the Greeks *Tiberias* because of the city on its western shore, built by Herod Antipas in 26 A.D. and named in honour of the reigning emperor.

*The mountain* (v. 3) is the elevated plain east of the lake; no single peak or hill is here in mind.

*Now the Passover, the feast of the Jews, was at hand* (v. 4.)—The notice is inserted so as to bring the event into connection with the contents of the following discourse, especially vv. 51-59, where the *Passover* lamb becomes the food of the church. What Jesus here does is of prototypal import and is thus connected with the mystery of the Passover ceremonial where also in wonderful fulness men feed from him. The verse thus does not explain the gathering of the multitudes; they would not cross the lake (v. 1), then return northward (vv. 22-25); nor is it inserted to explain the purpose of the people to make Jesus a king (v. 14). The words *the Passover* may be a late insertion; if they are omitted, the length of the public ministry is reduced to nearly the Synoptic measure of a single year (Westcott and Hort, *Greek N. T.*, ii. 77-81).

In vv. 5-14 Synoptic material lies at the basis of the presentation (Mk. viii. 30-44; Matt. xiv. 13-21; Lk. ix. 10-17); a brief comparison with the Synoptic narrative will bring out the Johannine features, and show the transformation of the tradition from didactic motives. In the Synoptics Jesus has taught and healed through the day, as evening approaches, the disciples come and request that the multitudes be sent

away for food and lodging ; Jesus bids his disciples feed them ; they have five loaves and two fishes, ask whether they shall buy bread for the multitude ; Jesus breaks the loaves ; the disciples distribute the food to the multitude who are apparently unaware of any miracle, and even the disciples do not clearly understand that one has been wrought (Mk. vi. 50, 51). In John, Jesus proposes to feed the multitudes *when he sees them coming*, there is no teaching, the feeding takes its place ; Philip and Andrew appear prominent (see i. 35-47) ; Jesus knows in the beginning what he (not God) is to do, and his question to Philip arises from no perplexity or problem ; the disciples do not ask whether they shall generously feed the multitude ; they are entirely without resource as without hospitality, since it is only a boy who has a few loaves and fishes ; Jesus feeds the multitudes without the aid of the disciples ; the whole multitude is amazed at the miracle and contemplates making him king. Everything emphasises the superiority of Jesus to his disciples and the magnitude and pure gratuity of the miracle as well as its symbolic significance ; all the people are said to be brought by it to a belief that Jesus is the *prophet that cometh into the world* (Deut. xviii. 15 Messianically interpreted) ; but in John the belief of the multitude as often even of the disciples is shown to be false or imperfect, and in following verses the multitude is presented as devoid of true faith (vv. 26, 41-43) ; in vv. 30-32 the people demand a *sign* (not *another* sign), like the ancient miracle of the manna, before they can believe. Thus the historical retreats behind the symbolic ; the features of the narrative, as in the Synoptics, remind one of the observance of the love-feast with its accompaniment of the Eucharistic rite, and in very early Christian literature and art the loaves and fishes appear as symbols of the Lord's Supper ; the discourse on Jesus as the true Bread, as eaten in the sacred rite, follows in vv. 52-59 ; the reference to the Old Test. pro-

phet (v. 14) brings into prominence the typical import : as the great prophetic types, such as Moses and Elisha, fed the wanderers with manna, or from twenty barley loaves fed a hundred men (2 Kings iv. 42-44 ; notice the similarity of detail), so the great antitype, Christ, as prophet, miraculously feeds the multitude.

The features noted above : the free transformation of Synoptic matter, the absence of any important need since there was food near, the demand for a sign as though none had been given, the use of Old Test. material—are quite decisive of the problem of historicity ; and though one must not hastily put limits to the Divine, the inconceivability of the increase of the substance is an important factor in the historical judgment. Of the various explanations the favourite psychological solution : that the trifle furnished each person miraculously satisfied the appetite, goes to wreck upon the impossibility of dividing one small thin cake into a thousand pieces. Weiss (*Commentar in loco; Leben Jesu*, ii., 200-1) finds at last relief in the conclusion that the event was a "miracle of providence," since by God's guiding power the Passover pilgrims had put plenty of food into their hamper and were inspired to furnish it freely for all ; herein he follows the rationalist Paulus.

The walking upon the lake (vv. 16-21) is clearly taken from the Synoptic narrative (Mk. vi. 45-52 ; Matt. xiv. 22-33; Luke omits).

*His disciples* (v. 16).—One thinks naturally of the inner circle, since they entered into one boat (v. 17) ; since *Jesus had not yet come to them* at full darkness, it would appear that they waited long for him. In the Synoptics Jesus sends them across the lake in advance.

*A great wind*                      *blew* (v. 18).—There is no storm or great danger, only severe head winds, as in v. 5 there was no apparent hunger.

*Five and twenty or thirty furlongs* (v. 19) is the equivalent of the Synoptic "midst of the sea" ; since the lake is at its widest about 55 furlongs. The phrase ἐπὶ τῇς θαλάσσης can be translated "at (the shore of) the lake," but the con-

text demands the rendering "upon the lake." The disciples do not know Jesus until he speaks, as in xx. 14-16.

*Immediately the boat was at the land (v. 21).*—The verse marks the widest deviation from the Synoptic version. There the disciples take Jesus into the boat; the wind ceases; the disciples must row in order to reach the western shore; here Jesus does not enter the boat; it is at once at the desired shore; the whole is accomplished by Jesus (see Ps. cvii. 30): an extension of the miracle to the whole group, as Matt. surpasses Mark by representing Peter as walking the water until his faith fails.

The typical reference could hardly be excluded: if Moses (Ex. xiv. 15-31), Elijah, and Elisha (2 Kings ii. 8, 14) had power over the waters, how much more the great antitype, the prophet Messiah.

The chief function of the narrative in this connection is clearly in its symbolism. If the bread (vv. 1-15) becomes symbol of the flesh of Christ in the Lord's Supper with especial reference to its institution as conditioned by his giving up his bodily life and going away (v. 51), the coming to the disciples upon the lake is symbol of the mystic presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper with especial reference to the permanent and prophetic function of the rite. Jesus feeds the multitudes, retires into a mountain, his disciples wait long for his return, he comes at length, but not into the boat to abide in gross corporeality; he is a real but mystic presence, free from conditions of time and space, who calms their fear and stills the storm and sets them at the desired haven. The allegory is clear. Jesus has fed the world with the bread of his life, he has gone into the heavenly mount, men have long waited for his Parousia, he has come but not as they expected, he is really but mystically present in the Eucharistic rite, to cheer, enhearten, save.

This is the post-apostolic situation and its view of the sacred rite; the Christology here inclines toward the Docetic; if the flesh of Christ, though real, was not of common human sort it might not be subject to the same conditions of gravity, space, and motion as other flesh.

The miracle is heightened as usual, that as phenomenon it may be worthy the Johannine Christ. The event is as far from the possibili-

ties of natural conditions as the raising of Lazarus, but it is so difficult to find any worthy and fitting purpose that it might easily be relegated to the realm of pure magic. The disciples were in no special danger; their faith had been sufficiently established by the preceding "signs"; the multitudes who might be won by such means were absent; an allaying the storm-wind, if possible to Jesus, would necessitate no walking upon the water. A bold display of miraculous power, capricious and fruitless, illy consorts with the known character of Jesus. The use of the narrative as allegory alone gives it value for us.

The special purpose of vv. 22-26 is to show that the multitude which listened to the discourse upon the bread in the synagogue at Capernaum is the same as that which had eaten the miraculous bread at the meal on the preceding day.

The explicit mention of the boats may also serve to prove that Jesus must have reached the western shore in some miraculous manner.

The transitional and introductory verses are in true Johannine manner. To the question *Rabbi, when camest thou hither?* (v. 25), Jesus makes no direct reply (so iii. 3; iv. 9, 20); but his answer is an accusation of a base and unspiritual frame of mind (v. 26), which the multitude is exhorted to abandon, and strive for the true bread of life.

*Work for the meat which abideth* (v. 27).—This abiding meat, placed in contrast to perishing food, is spiritual good, fulness of moral life, here given by the *Son of man* (see i. 51, comment) and therefore of transcendent value, especially since it is later identified with the person of the Son himself (v. 35). The thought is also Philonic: since he asserts that the heavenly manna, the food of the soul, is distributed by the Logos: a partial parallel also to the statement that to this end *God the Father* hath sealed the Son, *i. e.*, formally set him apart and certified him, as in impressing the seal upon wax, is Philo's affirmation that the Logos is the seal impressed upon the world. See v. 35, comment.

The verb ἐργάζεσθαι, "work for," "acquire," which

includes an ethical demand, is understood by the hearers, naturally but wrongly, as a command to fulfil some precepts of the law, whence the question: *What shall we do*, etc. (v. 28).

*This is the work of God*, etc. (v. 29).—The answer is also rebuke. Not the works of the law, but faith in the person of Messiah is the supreme condition; a Pauline thought. The situation supposed is that Jesus has proclaimed himself as Messiah and is now defending that position.

*What then dost thou for a sign*, etc. (v. 30).—The emphasis lies upon *thou*; the words *that we may believe thee* represent the multitude as in their own opinion unbelievers. But the same multitude in vv. 14, 15 is represented as having seen the great *sign* of the feeding the multitude, as believing on Jesus as Messiah, and purposing to proclaim him king. The usual explanation is that here is a demand for some special sign (from heaven, Matt. xvi. 1), since in v. 31 the miracle of the manna is mentioned; but one would expect some such phrase as “another sign.”

Wendt finds here his chief support for the hypothesis that this discourse did not originally belong to a Galilean journey.

Weiss explains that the multitude was on the preceding day only too ready to accept Jesus as Messiah, but became disbelieving on his refusal to be proclaimed king (v. 15); when now he still asserts his claim as Messiah they demand a Messianic “sign,” such as the manna giving by Moses, v. 31 (for the Old Test. passage see Ex. xvi. 11-36; Numb. xi. 7); which miracle the Rabbis expected Messiah to repeat. But in vv. 1-14 it is shown that the heavenly prophet had already fed the multitude a miraculous bread. The solution would probably be found, could we recover the sources used.

The thought of v. 32 is: the manna, a transitory and imperfect food, was in old time given by *God*, not *Moses*, and he now is giving you a true food; the proof of which superiority lies in the facts (v. 33) that (a) it *really* comes from heaven, (b) it gives *life*, (c) it gives that life, not as the *manna* was given, to *Israel* alone, but to the *world*.

The people remain enslaved in the material and earthly, as Nicodemus iii. 4, and the Samaritan woman iv. 15.

*I am the bread of life* (v. 35).—The word “I” has the emphasis, and denotes the whole person of Jesus, not simply his earthly manifestation. *He that cometh to me* denotes the ethical and religious acceptance of him and entrance into communion with him, which results in permanent spiritual satisfaction. The addition of the second clause with its mention of thirst indicates that the writer has even here in mind the cup of the Eucharist as a source or symbol of spiritual fellowship with Christ.

This metaphor is found in the writings of Philo, to whom the Logos is food for the soul, a heavenly manna. After citing Ex. xvi. 4 and 15, he says, “What then is this bread? This is the Logos which the Lord has appointed.” (*On Fugitives*, xxv.); and on the same passage he says in *Alleg.*, lix., lx., lxi.: “The food of the Lord is the continued Logos of the Lord”; “the soul of the more perfect man is nourished by the whole Logos.”

The reference in v. 36 is either to some unused sayings, or to v. 26, or to v., vv. 38-47 regarded as part of the same discourse from which vi. 27-71 has been disjoined.

This unbelief of the Jews is now traced to its source in the divine determinism (vv. 37-40). Jesus does not reject them; they are not among those who the Father hath given him; he, who does the Father's will, will give at the last day eternal life to all who believe on him.

On the phrase *I am come down from heaven* (v. 38) see iii. 13, comment.

*At the last day*, etc. (vv. 39, 40).—The phrase refers to the Parousia or second coming, one feature of which was to be a resurrection. Since elsewhere eternal life is declared to be a present possession, Wendt regards these phrases as interpolations, Holtzmann thinks them to be concessions to



current unspiritual modes of expression. See comment on vv. 28, 29.

The apparent paradox is however capable of explanation.

In knowledge of the Father and the Son, in a believing reception of the Christ, eternal life is given to the disciple *in principle and in potency*. But since the believer does not have life in himself, as Christ has life in himself, v. 26, these potencies (whose function is in part the raising up of the individual into a bodily life conformable to the nature of "the age to come") will at the Parousia be stimulated into activity by the life-giving power of Christ. Thus the believer, though dead, still lives, because he has within him potencies which will then be actualised; thus Christ is at once both *the resurrection and the life*. He could not be the resurrection were there not the death of the creature, he would not be in the fullest sense the life were there no resurrection; the resurrection is the result, not the cause, of the life; thereby bodily death has no longer the *significance* of death; the so-called dead live because the life-giving principle is in them.

The dissent and question of *the Jews* (vv. 41, 42), rest upon the same incapacity to understand spiritual truth as is displayed in iii. 4; iv. 11; vi. 34; there is also on the part of Jesus (v. 43) the same avoidance of direct answer.

The human parentage from both Joseph and Mary is not here denied, is explicitly affirmed in vii. 27, 28, where the concession goes beyond the limits of common rumour or report, and includes the *truth* of the common idea concerning the parentage. The whole question of the human origin is here (and elsewhere in the Gospel) treated with indifference. The ground of this lies in the Christology, since a pre-existent divine being changes only the form of his existence, and bodily origin is therefore unimportant. And the dualism of the Gospel, to which fleshly origin and spiritual existence are in such sharp antithesis, renders it

probable that the human and material elements of the Christ will be relegated to the unimportant if not to the unreal; thus the Christ-image, if hostile to, is in some features allied with, the Gnostic Docetism which so emphasised the spiritual as to reduce the fleshly to the realm of the phantasmal and illusive.

*No man can come to me (v. 44).*—The reply of Jesus is no explanation of the last question of v. 42, but a setting forth of the real ground of the Jewish disbelief. The ultimate cause of faith and ethical self-determination is neither in the personal will nor the word of Christ; it lies in the divine determinism that realises itself in man in a capacity or receptivity which responds to the "drawing" (ἐλκύειν). This is the necessary antecedent and condition of faith. Here also the psychology of the Gospel tends to approach that of the Gnostics, for whom the "pneumatic souls" (πνευματικοί) were destined to salvation by virtue of their spiritual constitution, while the "mud souls" (ῥυλικοί), having no organ of susceptibility, were unable to attain to faith and life. But in the fourth Gospel this fatalism is modified by a teaching of free-will and personal responsibility, hence the insoluble paradoxes; which, however, inhere in most systems of thought both religious and philosophical.

On the clause *And I will raise him up in the last day*, see vv. 39, 40, comment.

*It is written in the prophets (v. 45).*—The quotation is from Is. liv. 13, freely cited from the LXX. ; the emphasis lies upon the word "God," as shown by the following clause. In the original passage "all" (thy children) referred to the inhabitants of Zion; here it is designative of those who are to become believers.

While in the preceding verse the word "draw" indicated some mysterious process, the words "taught," "heard," "learned" set forth this divine influence which precedes faith and salvation under the symbols of education. All

those who have learned in this preparatory school are thereby and thereafter able to "*come unto me.*" The hearing and the learning cannot therefore refer to the reception of the Christian revelation, they precede it.

The following verse, *Not that any man hath seen the Father* (v. 46), is designed to obviate the assumption of too near approach to the unique superiority of the Logos-Christ; he alone hath seen the Father; the hearing and learning constitute therefore an inferior and internal revelation, preparatory to the reception of the higher. Since this hearing and learning as lower and subjective are put into antithesis with seeing as higher and objective; since, while some men have heard and learned, no man hath seen; since he who hath seen, *i. e.*, the Son, is "from the Father"; since the verb is in both instances in the perfect tense (ἐώρακε), it is probable that we have here an affirmation of a real and conscious personal pre-existence of Christ as distinguished from a simply ideal one. But the Johannine discourse is so loaded with figurative and symbolic elements that dogmatism is not permissible. Compare viii. 34-41 where the Jews have heard from their father, Satan; as Jesus has seen his Father, God.

On vv. 47, 48, see v. 35, comment.

In vv. 49, 50 the thought of vv. 32-35 is restated, but there is a more explicit comparison between the Old Test. manna and the heavenly Bread from the point of view of permanent result. The word "die" is used in the same manner as in xi. 25, 26. For this meaning see comment on vi. 29, 30.

*And the bread which I will give is my flesh for the life of the world* (v. 51).—The notable and perplexing new element introduced here is the symbolism. In the former part of the verse Christ is in his *person* the bread, living and therefore life-giving bread, from heaven, given by the Father; in the latter he has become the prospective giver instead of the

given, and his gift is here declared to be his flesh which he bestows for the life of the world.

What is the meaning of the word "flesh" here and in vv. 52-56?

The earliest interpretation was that flesh denotes "the whole human manifestation of the Logos," the enfleshment in which Christ devoted himself to the salvation of the world. But clearly the tense of the verb ( $\delta\acute{\omega}\sigma\omega$ , *I will give*) points to some future act or series of acts. Akin is the interpretation that "flesh" is the designation of his earthly nature, as weak and finite; one must believe in him as such a created earthly Son of man in order to find life. But against this the just-mentioned objection also holds. A more widely-held opinion is that "flesh" means the bodily life and that the reference here is to the "atoning death" of Christ. But the gift here to be made is a gift to man not to God; the element of truth here is that the death and ascension are indeed a condition of the fleshly organism becoming a spiritual body which may be a continued medium for the promotion of faith and life.

The Patristic, Catholic, and modern Protestant interpretation is to be preferred; the discourse in vv. 51-56 elaborates the true doctrine of the Lord's Supper: the "flesh" is (a) literally the flesh of Christ which as *earthly flesh* or body is given in the acts of passion and death in so far as the passion and death are the inevitable condition of the return from the earthly into the heavenly state, but as *heavenly glorified body* or *flesh* is given by the ascended Son of man in the rite of the Lord's Supper; (b) symbolically, mystically, the "flesh" is the person himself, Christ the heavenly being received by faith which finds its consummation and continued nutriment in the act of communion. Thus the believer, in the act of receiving the emblems, receives also in the mystery of the sacrament both the heavenly body of Jesus and the spiritual potencies which constitute salvation and ensure

the continuance of his real life at death, together with the transformation, at the resurrection, of his earthly bodily organism into a heavenly one. This twofold sense of the word "flesh" is in entire conformity with Johannine method; see, *e.g.*, on the words *ἄνωθεν*, *κρίσις*, comment on iii. 3, 17-19.

If it be objected that this interpretation makes salvation depend upon an external act rather than an inner faith, the answer is that the inner faith accompanies the act and constitutes its real value, so that there is here no antithesis. Meyer's objection that the "eating" and "drinking" of v. 54 must then be taken literally is valueless, since these terms are, like "flesh," clearly used in the double sense; they denote both the physical act of communion and its spiritual accompaniment: the feeding of the believing soul on Christ; precisely this interfusion of reality and symbol, of the earthly and heavenly, the physical and spiritual, is the characteristic of the Johannine mysticism. In chap. xx. the corporeality of Jesus undergoes change; it may not be touched before the Ascension, which occurs between the points of time indicated by vv. 17 and 19; thereafter it may be; it is a mystical body, a flesh more wonderful than that which walked the sea; it is among believers when doors are shut; it is now in heaven, now on earth.

The similarity of the terms used here to those of the institution of the Eucharist is so great as to justify the inference that the same theme is in question. It is true that here we have "flesh" (*σὰρξ*), in the Synoptics "body" (*σῶμα*); but in second-century sources, such as Ignatius and Justin, we find "flesh" so used. The utterance of the disciples in v. 60: *This is a hard saying*, finds here a rational explanation; while if the whole passage, vv. 51-58, simply indicates the necessity of spiritual communion with Christ the "hardness" of the saying becomes unintelligible. So in v. 62 the "*ascent of the Son of man where he was before*," *i.e.* the Ascension, as a visible event, would be proof that his bodiliness, now glorified and heavenly, was even more free from the conditions of space and weight than the

flesh in the earthly life, where it already mysteriously and miraculously appears and disappears ; see comment on v. 21, and viii. 59 ; xii. 36. The earthly corporeality moves in the sphere of the miraculous, much more the heavenly ; therefore it can become in a real sense the food of men ; it becomes the vehicle of the spiritual potencies which secure life to the believer, even in so-called death (see comment on vv. 39-40). This union of the literal and symbolic, which *we* sharply differentiate, is found in the contemporary Ignatius, who asserts that his opponents abstain from the Eucharist "because they confess not the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, and which the Father of his goodness raised up again" (*Smyrneans*, vii., 1 ; the same identification in *ad Rom.* vii.) : and Justin says of the Eucharistic bread and wine that "we do not receive these as common bread and drink," but "have been taught that the food which has been blessed by the prayer of his Word and from which our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh."

This connection of the Eucharist with the *life* rather than the *death* of Christ ; the evident intention to meet objections from within the Church as from without, since the doctrine is "hard" ; the advance beyond Paul ; the approach to the idea of the heathen "Mysteries,"—all indicate the late date of the discourse in its present form. In any case the form and idea are chiefly from the evangelist or his school ; the historical Jesus had at this stage of his ministry neither announced his Messiahship nor predicted his death ; this controversy belongs to the post-apostolic age.

*How can this man give us his flesh to eat? v. (52).*—The Jewish want of comprehension appears here ; its hostility to the rite of the Eucharist.

In the following verse (53), in Johannine fashion, no attempt is made to clear up the mystification, but the thought is given in negative form and with the added element of drinking the blood, which was still more repugnant to Jewish sentiment ; but to the Christian, the eating the flesh is a real partaking of the mystic body of the heavenly Christ and thereby and therewith a spiritual appropriation of him ; a *manducatio spiritualis*.

*I will raise him up at the last day (v. 54):* see comment on vv. 38, 39.

In v. 56 the thought of eating Christ is strengthened by the use of a new verb: *τρῶγω* is literally "to gnaw or crunch"; since this denotes a more continuous process, it well introduces the idea of the *abiding* union of the believer and Christ.

*I live because of the Father (v. 57).*—The word *διὰ* here denotes the *ground*, not the *aim* or *purpose* or *method*, of life; as food is the source of the continued bodily life, so is Christ to his disciples.

Verse 58 is summary, recapitulation; see vv. 33, 49, 51.

*This is a hard saying (v. 60).*—The disciples now, as the Jews (v. 52), find difficulty in this teaching concerning the Eucharist. The hardness consists in the acceptance of the mystery; the factors of the anticipated death or the spiritual appropriation of Christ contain no elements of difficulty.

*What then if ye should behold the Son of Man ascending where he was before? (v. 62).*—The question is addressed to disciples; the reference is to the Ascension, here presented as future: the emphasis is on the verb *behold*, which must be here understood in the literal sense; the sentence is to be completed by some such phrase as "would ye then not be able to understand?" As chap. xx. teaches, the corporeality of the Son of Man, already mysterious, is at the resurrection and ascension changed from an earthly to a heavenly one, which as glorified body or flesh is the vehicle of the post-ascension life; and since it was more free from the limitations of earthly existence, it became the medium by which the presence of Christ was recognised in his post-ascension appearances to his disciples, his descents from and ascents into heaven, xx. 19-23; 26-29; xxi. 1-22; and is now as mysteriously connected with the gross visible elements of bread and wine. See comment on v. 51.

But (v. 63) since it is only the spirit that giveth spiritual life, and flesh, whether gross, earthly flesh, or the glorified corporeality, can therefore in the things of the Spirit profit nothing ; so in the sacred rite, the physical, fleshly elements, though necessary, themselves communicate no life ; this comes from the words which are the living essence of Christ the Spirit. Thus the rite remains in its essence spiritual, yet the material is blended with it after the manner of Johannine mysticism.

*There are some of you that believe not (v. 64).*—The verse gives the ground of the non-reception of the teaching of vv. 27-59 ; it was fundamental unbelief, concealed from men but known to the Logos-Christ, on whose foreknowledge especially as concerned Judas see comment on xiii. 21-30 ; also ii. 19, 21. As to the determinism of v. 65, see comment on vi. 44. Therefore the defection of many of the disciples (v. 66) ; the division has its cause behind the impulse of the moment, it is fatal defect of nature.

*The twelve (v. 67)* are only mentioned here ; in the context, vv. 70, 71 ; and xx. 24. Inside this small group there is also division ; Judas is false. The question of the verse is for the purpose of securing a decision, not information.

*The Holy One of God (v. 69)* is a designation of Messiah ; the confession is made by Peter in the name of the twelve ; the word “ we ” is emphatic ; the tense of the verbs indicates continued conviction and finds its explanation in i. 41 : Messianic belief from the first. The section 66-69 is therefore the Johannine parallel of the Synoptic Peter-confession (Matt. xvi. 13-20 ; Mk. viii. 27-30 ; Luke ix. 18-21) ; it most resembles Luke’s account, where the incident immediately follows the feeding of the multitude ; what is there the sudden outburst of individual conviction slowly formed from association with Jesus is here the united and formal expression of a long-cherished belief (i. 41, 51 ; ii. 11, etc.). The “ crisis ” of the chapter is therefore *as event* superficial,



the visible separation of true believers from half-believers and unbelievers ; both classes were already innerly chosen and determined. As to the choice of Judas, vv. 70, 71, see comment on xiii. 21-30.

The heightened conflict of the Light with the darkness, vii. 1-52.

Jesus, leaving Galilee and appearing in Jerusalem at the feast of Tabernacles, asserts his divine commission, causes question and division among the multitudes, and increases the hostility of the Pharisees until they plan his arrest.

*The Jews sought to kill him* (vii. 1): The reference is to v. 18. The tense of the verbs here used indicates a prolonged stay in Galilee.

*The feast of Tabernacles* (v. 2) was in the autumn ; the previous events (vi. 4) in the spring ; the Galilean sojourn, therefore, some five or six months.

*His brethren* (v. 3) are his physical brothers ; for their names see Matt. xiii. 55. The reason for their request, *i. e.*, *that thy disciples also may behold thy works which thou doest*, occasions difficulties, since its presuppositions are that the disciples are in Judea, that they have beheld no miracles (but see ii. 23 ; iii. 2 ; iv. 45). The explanation that the Galilean disciples were to attend the feast, and that the miracles in Galilee had been insufficient to support their faith, only partially clears up the situation. Wendt (*Das Joh-evgl.*, 133 f.) maintains that the section is from a source in which the events of chapter vi. had not preceded ; and also asserts that, had such been the case, the brothers would have been believers. It is possible that they were waiting to see whether his Messianic claims would be accepted at the capital, and pressed for a decision. Such an attitude, in which there was only cold calculation, no faith or spiritual quickening, would from the evangelists' standpoint warrant the statement : *For even his brethren did not believe on him.*

*My time* (v. 6).—The phrase means here the propitious

season for bringing the word and cause of Jesus to recognition and victory, as ii. 4; the reason why it has not come is found in the following verse (7): it is the hate of the world (*κόσμος*) on account of his testimony against its procedure and spirit; while his brothers, in accord with the world, have no need to wait. The cold tone is also one of rebuke; it is the Logos-Christ rather than the brother who speaks, as he does to his mother in ii. 4.

*I go not up yet unto this feast* (v. 8).—The word “yet” is to be omitted; the best MSS. diverge; one class reads “not” (*οὐκ*), the other “not yet” (*οὐπω*); the latter is a gloss to avoid a difficulty; the earliest copies must have read *I go not*, as Porphyry in the 3d century accused Jesus of “fickleness” because he afterwards went. “*My time*” must here denote the sojourn in Galilee; this was not yet completed, the work not done; so Jesus then thought; reflection might induce, did induce, a change of plan.

*Then went he also up* (v. 10).—This is the final departure from Galilee; the crisis there is reached in vi. 1–vii. 9. In the Synoptics the final departure is some six months later, at the nearing of the Passover feast. Luthardt asserts, without support in this Gospel, that Jesus returned to Galilee.

*The Jews* (v. 11) are, as in v. 13, the enemies of Jesus; they are sometimes discriminated from the mass of the people; they are an ideal representative; so that we have in v. 13 the curious combination: *Howbeit no man* (of the Jews) *spake openly of him for fear of the Jews*.

The self-proclamation of Jesus, appropriate to his “*seeking to be known openly*” (v. 4) and introductory to his activity at Jerusalem, consists of three parts, each set into the framework of incident and controversy: the divine source of his doctrine and its authority, vv. 15–24; his own person and origin, vv. 25–31; his earthly fate and return to the Father, vv. 32–36. The immediate result is division and increased hostility, vv. 37–52.

*How knoweth this man letters?* (v. 15).—The word *letters* (γράμματα) here signifies the learned explanation of the law. Jesus is therefore self-taught but superior, so that *the Jews marvelled*. The answer of Jesus is that he is taught of God. Were it not for the word “marvelled,” one might regard the question as irony; Wendt thinks it was so in the author’s “source,” where vv. 17-24 followed v. 47. See comment on v. 19, below.

*If any man willeth to do his will*, etc. (v. 17).—The word “his” refers to God. This will of God was to the Jew objectively given in the Law (v. 19); but the word *will* is here used in a wider sense; right attitude of heart and will furnishes the true condition of judgment: he whose heart is set on God’s will is the true judge. “I believe in order that I may know.”

The following verses, 19-24, belong by contents and connection to chapter v., and may be regarded as a continuation of v. 47. Moses and the Law; the endeavour to kill Jesus, v. 19 (see v. 16); the *one work*, v. 21 (v. 5-9); *ye all marvel*, v. 21 (the same audience as v. 10-16); the recent cure on the Sabbath and Jewish anger, v. 23 (see v. 16);—all are common to both. The preceding verses (15<sup>b</sup>-18) may also have belonged to the same connection (Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, i., 228 ff.; *Das JohEvglm.*, 79 ff.; Bacon, *Am. J. Theol.*, Oct. 1900). See Introduction, § 5.

*Did not Moses give you the law?* (v. 19).—In *this* connection the question may be regarded as an assumption of the offensive, as vv. 15-18 had been defensive. The very ones who have pride in the Law do not keep it; since they would disobey it in seeking the life of Jesus. It was a common belief which Jesus probably also shared that the whole Pentateuch came from Moses.

The words *why seek ye to kill me* refer to v. 16.

*Thou hast a devil* (v. 20).—The multitude attribute the question of v. 19 to a demon, *i. e.*, to an insane delusion, as viii. 48.

*I did one work* (v. 20): see vv. 5-9; the healing of the

impotent man. See above, introduction to v. 19, where also "ye all marvel" finds explanation.

In vv. 22-24 is contained a defence of the healing the impotent man on the Sabbath and a reply to the resulting attack, vv. 5-16. The argument is from the less to the greater : if it is justifiable to break the letter of the Sabbath law in order to purify a *single member* of the body, as is the case in circumcision, how much more justifiable in order to make a man *every whit whole* ? The regulations as to circumcision are to be found in Gen. xvii. 10-14 ; Lev. xii. 3. The Rabbis asserted that circumcision "sets aside the Sabbath."

There follows (vv. 25-29) a discussion of a single feature of Messianic evidences, such a feature as doubtless often appeared in apostolic or post-apostolic controversies with Jews ; the earliest written Gospels presented Jesus as from Galilee ; the later as born [in Bethlehem but resident in Galilee. Therefore the objection : no man knoweth whence Messiah is ; but we know whence this man is. It was a frequent belief that Messiah would at the critical time appear suddenly, mysteriously ; many awaited him from heaven.

The argument of vv. 28-29 is : it is true that you know me and my origin historically, externally, as Joseph's son, vi. 42. But *you* know not God the spirit ; I know him, I am from him, and he sent me, therefore, really, innerly, I am the Sent of the Sender, the Messiah. Thus is the objection overcome. The phrase "from him" signifies here equality of nature with God (as the assertion of v. 17) ; only thus can one account for the opening statement of v. 30.

*His hour was not yet come* (v. 30) : the hour for his falling into the power of the Jews. The clause represents the Divine determination ; the human cause may be found in v. 31 ; the multitude was in part composed of Galileans, who had seen his signs.

*I go unto him that sent me (v. 33).*—The answer is here designed to show the folly of the proposed course (v. 32). Jesus' death and return to the Father will only withdraw his saving presence and end the opportunity of deliverance; *they shall seek him* in the coming calamities (as Lk. xvii. 22; xix. 43 f.; xxi. 20-24), when men cry for Messiah to deliver them, *but shall not find him*. So in viii. 21.

Thus the Jews in their stupidity misapprehend, therefore scornfully ask

*Will he go unto the Dispersion among the Greeks? (v. 36).*—The Dispersion was the name given to the Jews who dwelt outside the Holy Land; there were three great settlements in Babylonia, Egypt, Syria; but smaller colonies in Asia Minor, Greece, Italy, etc. After v. 33 the question is pure stupidity

*The last day (v. 37)* was the seventh, for the eighth day was not usually reckoned as a celebration of the feast of Tabernacles. A daily libation, a solemn ceremony of offering to Jehovah water from Siloam that winter rains might be assured from him, has perhaps furnished the evangelist with a setting for the utterance: *If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink*. Here Christ *is*, not *gives* as in iv. 10-14, the living water, in the sense that the water gushes forth from within him; he is the fountain, and the essence of the fountain is the gushing water.

*He that believeth on me (v. 38).*—The clause is better translated "If" or "since he believeth on me," and prefixed to the preceding sentence, so that the whole might be well rendered, "If any one truly have faith in me let him come to me and drink; as the Scripture saith (concerning Messiah): Out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." This he spake of the Spirit which believers were to receive from him. Thus interpreted, the utterance and its context become coherent and consistent; the content is Christological; Christ is, whether present or absent, the fountain of life

to believers ; the relation of believers to the world is not in question ; the grace here bestowed is not that which *originates* but that which *strengthens* and *perfects* belief.

The source of the Scripture quotation cannot be given ; it is probably a free combination of Old Test. passages ; see Is. xlv. 3 ; lv. 1 ; lviii. 11 ; Ezek. xlvii. 1, 12 ; Zech. xii. 10 ; xiii. 1. The word "belly" may be rendered "body," "inner parts." In ancient architecture, probably on Herod's palace (*Bell. Jud.*, v., iv., 4), gargoyles were used, and these sometimes were fashioned into human form.

*For the Spirit was not yet given* (v. 39).—The word *given* has no equivalent in the Greek ; *the Spirit was not yet*. The Spirit here is the Spirit of God which dwelt in its fulness in Christ so that it became not only the principle of his manifestation, but, as proceeding from him, became in believers the principle of the Christian life : but only after the resurrection and glorification is it in such way set free that it can operate as an independent principle, be described if not conceived as a person ; sometimes said to be sent by the Father, sometimes by Christ, sometimes is identified with Christ, sometimes takes his place. The language is mystical ; but since the Spirit has the real ground of its existence in the Son, as the Son has his in the Father, the Spirit, as the energy of the Son, does not come into perfected existence until the glorification of the Son.

In vv. 40-52 is described the division of opinion.

*These words* (v. 40) refer to vv. 16-24 ; 28, 29 ; 33, 34 ; 37-39.

*Hath not the scripture said*, etc. (v. 42) : see Is. xi. 1 ; Jer. xxiii. 5 ; Mic. v. 1.

In vv. 48-49 is brought forward the Jewish objection that the Christians were of the lowest class ; men should be guided by the opinion of the rulers and the representatives of orthodoxy, the Pharisees.

*Nicodemus saith unto them* (v. 50) ; see comment on iii. 1 ; and introduction to chapter iii. Here Nicodemus appears as no believer : but as " ruler of the Jews," and " knowing their law," he gives his opinion that even their own law condemns their unfairness. The scornful answer (v. 52) shows the embittered feeling. The thesis : out of Galilee ariseth no prophet, expresses the pride of the capital ; it is a weapon of attack upon Christians, and may assist in explaining why the evangelist is so solicitous to represent the chief seat of Jesus' activity as Jerusalem and vicinity ; he is no obscure provincial prophet.

The situations of vii. 15-52 resemble those which the Synoptics record in connection with the final entry at the Passover feast, but have the Johannine features ; they are specimens of anti-Jewish polemic ; see general introduction, § 4.

#### Jesus and the adulteress, vii. 53-viii. 11.

This section is absent from the most authoritative manuscripts (Codices Sin. and Vat. ; it was not in Alex. and Eph., which are here defective) and the early Fathers ; it was either a floating oral tradition, or a section of some lost Gospel writing ; the Gospel to the Hebrews had some similar or identical narrative, and Harnack says (*Chronologie*, 624) that one may " on good grounds " regard it as a part of the Gospel of Peter. It came gradually into the texts of John during the fourth and following centuries ; was probably at first a marginal addition. Lightfoot's conjecture that it was first attached as an illustration of viii. 15 has some weight (*Cont. Rev.*, Oct., 1875). The whole representation is after the manner of the Synoptic tradition ; there is strong probability of its authenticity, and that it took place during the week of the final Passover feast. It is, like Mk. xi. 27-33 ; xii. 13-34, an account of a futile attempt to entrap Jesus.

*And the Scribes and the Pharisees bring a woman taken in adultery* (viii. 3).—*The Scribes* are not mentioned in this Gospel ; a Synoptic phrase. Why the woman was in the vicinity is not stated ; it has been suggested that she was being brought for trial at some session held in a temple hall ; her accusers presented her before Jesus as a test ; it

was no part of a legal process. The woman may have been betrothed only, not married.

*In the law Moses commanded us to stone such (v. 5) :* see Lev. xx. 10, Deut. xxii. 22-24.

*Tempting him (v. 6).*—The dilemma is similar to that concerning tribute, Mk. xii. 13-17. A decision against the law would be an assumption of superiority over Moses ; a decision for the death penalty would be treason against Roman authorities, who reserved to themselves the right of dealing with capital crimes, and did not regard adultery as such. The act of writing may denote absorption or designed obliviousness, or be a symbol of divine forgiveness for a deed of momentary passion (Jer. xvii. 13).

*He that is without sin among you (v. 7).*—Jesus evades the dilemma by transferring the problem from the legalistic to the moral realm, and at the same time leaving the law intact. It was commanded therein that witnesses cast the first stones, then the people (Deut. xvii. 6, 7). Execute the law, says Jesus, but do it in conscience, in humility, in love ; let the sinless man begin. See Matt. vii. 1-5. In shame they departed.

*Did no man condemn thee ? (v. 11).*—The verb, as in v. 12, is used in a legalistic sense ; the phrase : *Go and sin no more*, shows a moral disapproval. Jesus did not regard himself as administrator of external law, Lk. xii. 14.

**Jesus the Light of the world, viii. 12-ix. 41.**

Jesus is the light of the world, self-testifying yet having the witness of the Father. vv. 12-20 ; the conflict of light and darkness, of Jesus and the Jews, will issue in his return unto the Father and their death in their sins, vv. 21-29 ; this difference of issue has its ultimate ground in the fact that the Jews though boasting of freedom and descent from Abraham are in reality enslaved children of the devil, while Jesus is Son of the Father and was before Abraham, vv. 30-59 ; as Light-giver to the world Jesus heals a man born blind, ix. 1-12 ; the Jewish unbelief despite this sign is due to stubborn blindness, vv. 13-34 ; the result is a division among the Jews, the



humble blind receive sight, the learned Pharisees become blind, vv 35-41.

The situation is the same as that of ch. vii.; the antagonism increases as the discussion proceeds and culminates in fierce denunciation by Jesus and murderous attacks by Pharisees; the points of dispute concern the person and origin of the Logos-Christ and the nature of the witness by which his claims are substantiated; it is the separation of Christianity from Judaism as a phenomenon of apostolic and post-apostolic history which is here described as a series of scenes in the life of Jesus.

*Again (viii. 12)*: see vii. 37. On the light, the Logos as light, see comment on i. 4; the light is the principle which supplies a religious and ethical knowledge of the truth; that its reception is morally conditioned is shown by the phrase "he that followeth me"; truth is a *result* of faith and obedience as well as a *cause*, see comment on vii. 17. Thus also the *darkness* is ethical as well as intellectual. As in nature light increases vitality, so Jesus is the light of men, resultant in life.

There follows a discussion concerning the witness to Christ, as in v. 31-47. The self-witness of Jesus is here declared valid because of his nature and his self-knowledge; self-witness from a man or from Jesus as man would not be valid (such is also probably the sense of v. 31); but from Jesus as incarnate Logos it is so in the highest degree; such is the force of the words, *For I know whence I came and whither I go* (v. 14); it is the self-consciousness of the pre-existent Son of Man from heaven which utters itself here. See comment on vii. 28, 33. Knowledge of this is denied the Jews, therefore

*Ye judge after the flesh* (v. 15): *i. e.*, ye judge my self-testimony as if I were only man, as in appearance I am. *I judge no man*; denial of the function in general; as to judgment by the Son, see comment on iii. 17-19; v. 22, 27-30.

*In your law it is written* (v. 17); see Deut. xvii. 6; xix. 15.

*Where is thy Father?* (v. 19).—The Jews think of physical fatherhood; there is a failure to comprehend due to gross stupidity; a characteristic of the Johannine representation, see iii. 3; iv. 11, 15. *If ye had known me, ye would have known my Father also*: because the same absence of ethical and spiritual discernment which prevents the Jews from recognising the true nature of the Logos-Christ hinders them also from attaining a knowledge of the God who as a Spirit is only spiritually discerned. Since then they do not know the witness, they cannot judge the value of the testimony.

*The treasury* (v. 20) here signifies those apartments in the Court of the Women where the supplies of corn, oil, wine, moneys, etc., were stored.

*His hour*: as vii. 30, see comment.

*Again* (v. 21) may designate another day and occasion; the opposition, initiated by Jesus, becomes sharper.

*I go away* (v. 21); see comment on v. 14; vii. 28, 33.

*Ye shall seek me and shall die in your sin*: the first phrase indicates a searching after a Messiah political rather than spiritual, and thus corresponds to Luke xvii. 22; xix. 41-44; or a search after Jesus for deliverance from perils to person and nation, as in Matt. xxiv.; Mk. xiii; but it will then be too late; the rejection of Jesus is the doom of the people; the word "die" signifies physical death but includes rejection from the Messianic Kingdom at the Parousia, since they have not the vitalising principle, see comment on vi. 39, 40. The *sin* is here the wilful rejection of Jesus as Messiah.

*Will he kill himself?* (v. 22).—The question is stupid, as in v. 19, or sarcastic; death would cause a departure to Hades (perhaps, in the case of a suicide, to Gehenna: Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, iii. vi. 5); thither they could not follow. The answer (vv. 23, 24) sets forth the antithesis of "this world" or "below" and a higher world or "above":

the reference is not to *origin*, but *appurtenance*, though here the difference is trifling, since if Messiah belong to that supra-mundane world he must spiritually originate in it; but that attitude of the will, not predetermining constitution, is here in question is shown by the phrase: *except ye believe that I am he* (i. e., Messiah): on the word "die" see comment on v. 21.

*Who art thou?* (v. 25).—The structure of the Greek in this *question* indicates the extreme of contempt and hostility; therefore the translation of the *answer* as given in the margin is to be preferred: *How is it that I even speak to you at all?*; an outburst forced from the soul by the perception of the utter folly of wasting words on such stupid, stiff-necked hostility. If the other translation be taken, the words "from the beginning" refer to the fact that in this Gospel the claim of Messiahship is early made or recognised.

*I have many things to speak and judge* (v. 26).—The emphasis lies upon *many* things; this affirmation is no contradiction of v. 25; the task seems hopeless, but it is the Father's will, to accomplish which he is sent; his words are not only revelation but judgment, therefore may be spoken into hostile ears.

*When ye have lifted up the Son of Man* (v. 28).—The verb (*ὑψώσῃτε*) here (as iii. 14, comment) indicates two processes: (1) the Jews will lift up the Son of Man on the cross and (2) thereupon the Father will lift him (through the Ascension) to himself, to the glory which he before had with him; as a consequence of which will follow such phenomena (gift of the Spirit, spread of the Church, wars, calamities upon Jews, overthrow of nation, etc.) that they will be obliged to see therein a substantiation of all the claims of Christ. On the significance of the phrase "Son of Man," see i. 51, comment; on the affirmation "I do nothing of myself," see v. 19, comment.

*Many believed on him* (v. 30).—The statement causes diffi-

culty, as does the same verb in v. 31, since the persons here addressed as believers are in vv. 40, 44 denounced as murderers in heart and children of the devil. Either (1) the verb denotes a very defective faith, a spasmodic emotion, see ii. 27 ; or (2) an interval must be interposed between the verses 30 and 40 ; an act of exegetical violence ; or (3) the author disregards the historical situation. Wendt supposes 30 and 31<sup>a</sup> interpolations of the evangelist, who inferred from the word " abide " in the source that a belief already existed.

*If ye abide in my word (v. 31):* the phrase here is equivalent to the expression " to have faith," when understood ethically ; continued practical adherence to Jesus' word will bring knowledge, see vii. 17, comment ; therefore

*Ye shall know the truth (v. 32).*—This is the ripe fruit of discipleship ; the *truth* includes especially the nature of God, the true being or person and function of the Son ; *and this is life eternal, that they should know thee the only true God and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ ;* xvii. 3.

*We be Abraham's seed (v. 33).*—The Jewish reply displays the usual stupidity and therefore fleshly apprehension ; see vv. 19, 22 ; iii. 4, and often. The assertion of the Jews that they never have *been in bondage to any man* is false if the word *bondage* be used in a political sense ; and it is to be so taken ; the evangelist designed to make them utter a falsehood, for they are *children of the devil, who is a liar and the father thereof*, v. 44.

The simile of vv. 34-36 finds its explanation in the relation to Abraham, v. 33. Since the Jews belong to Abraham's house, the theocracy, they claim freedom and participation in Messianic blessedness. But they are sinners, therefore are degraded to servants, therefore liable to expulsion, since servants abide not for ever. But sons abide, and Jesus, *the Son*, who himself abides *for ever*, will, by freeing them from sin, raise them to the position of children (*Beloved, now are we the children of God*, 1 John iii. 2) and thus secure to

them the blessed fortune of Messianic life. This is *to be free indeed*.

*I speak the things which I have seen with my Father* (v. 38).—Here is resumed the attack upon the Jews by a repetition of the thought of v. 23. The Jews are outwardly Abraham's seed, ethically they are the children of the devil. The thought of a distinction between physical and spiritual Israel is prominent in Rom. iv. 11, 12; Gal. iii. 6-9. The criterion here is ethical, therefore in this passage there is no assertion of pre-existence, either of Jesus or his opponents.

*We were not born of fornication* (v. 41).—The word *fornication* is here to be taken in a religious sense; Jesus denies to the Jews religious similarity to Abraham, as he concedes their physical descent from him; the Jews reply: Well, then, if you wish to talk of religious parentage, we were not born of polytheism with its many deities, we have *one* Father, God. See Is. lxiii. 16.

On v. 42, as respects its Christology, see Introduction, § 2.

*Ye are of your father the devil* (v. 44).—The assertion is here made as explanation of the charges in the preceding verse; the descent is spiritual; the devil is the regnant ethical and spiritual principle in the world, the Jews are of the world, therefore his children; their desire is murder, since he *was a murderer from the beginning* (i. e., since he is the personal principle of all ungodly activity in the world, he incited the murder of Abel); and their speech is lie, since he *is a liar and the father of it*, moves in the element of unreality and deception, as Jesus in that of the truth.

*Which of you convicteth me of sin?* (v. 46).—The argument is that since the Jews cannot convict Jesus of sin, they should receive his word as truth, since unsullied virtue assures the perception of truth; the sinlessness of Jesus is not here affirmed, but proof of the contrary is denied; it is however the teaching of the Gospel.

*Thou art a Samaritan* (v. 48).—The word, a term of

reproach, means renegade, heretic, schismatic. Thus the Jews answer the attack of v. 44 ; and add *thou hast a demon*, art possessed by an evil spirit in the service of the very Satan whom you call our father.

*There is one that seeketh and judgeth (v. 50).*—The words “ my glory ” are to be understood after the first verb, the word “ us ” after the second. From judgment with its sequence for sinners, the thought turns to deliverance ; therefore

*If a man keep my word he shall never see death (v. 51).*—The verse is a repetition of the assertion of vi. 39, 40 ; see comment on the passage.

He who in the Samaritan discourse was greater than “ our father Jacob,” iv. 12, in the Galilean greater than Moses the manna-giver, vi. 31, 32, 49, is here presented as greater than Abraham, vv. 52-58.

The Jewish argument is : he who can prevent physical death, must himself be immune from such death. Abraham and the prophets are dead ; art thou greater ? *whom makest thou thyself ? (v. 53).* The answer is that Jesus has a glory whose source is the Father ; whom they as liars know not, but whom Jesus fully knows ; by virtue of this glory he is greater than Abraham ; for

*Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad (v. 56).*—The margin, *that he should see*, is to be preferred. The thought is : I am so much superior to Abraham, your great ancestor, that he in prophetic recognition of my glory exulted (such is the force of the verb) in the anticipation that he should see my day. In the word *rejoiced* lies also reproof : Abraham exulted even *in the anticipation*, his seed are angry *at the realisation*. “ *My day* ” is the time of appearance of Jesus in the flesh, the Messianic appearance. The seeing the day and the gladness, which as fulfilment must be separated from the anticipatory exultation, refer either to some later event in the

earthly life of Abraham, as the birth of Isaac as an event securing progeny and guaranteeing fulfilment; or an announcement of the incarnation to Abraham in the Paradise of the underworld. According to the *Testament of Levi* (xii Patr. 111) Messiah "shall open the gates of Paradise and Abraham and Isaac and Jacob be joyful."

*Thou art not yet fifty years old* (v. 57).—The Jews understand v. 56 to assert that the life-periods of Abraham and Jesus overlap. How foolish! We should expect the question to take the form: "Hath Abraham seen thee?" (which is the reading of codex Sin.), but it is more contemptuous to reverse it. The natural inference from the words "*not yet fifty*" would be that (the Jews thought that) Jesus was more than forty years of age, and Irenæus (*Heresics* ii. 22, 5) says that the Gospel and all the elders testify "that Jesus while a teacher was between forty and fifty years of age," and adds that "those who were conversant in Asia with John, the disciple of the Lord" asserted that the information came from him. But fifty may be a round number, over against the centuries since Abraham lived.

*Before Abraham was I am* (v. 58).—The word *γενέσθαι* may be rendered "was born" or "came into being." The contrast is twofold: (1) as to persons, (2) as to predicates. The one is the man Abraham who comes into being; the other the Logos-Christ whose existence is an eternal "I am." See comment on the verb *εἰμί* in the clause: *In the beginning was the Logos*, i. 1. Thus the personal pre-existence is clearly taught. Had the pre-existence been conceived as merely ideal, as in the thought or purpose of God, the imperfect tense would have been used: Before Abraham was born, I was. The assertion of ideal pre-existence would have caused no anger.

*Jesus hid himself* (v. 59).—The margin is accurate; *was hidden*, as xii. 36; he was no coward; God miraculously hid him.

In these polemic sections, 12-59, where the tension is highest, the insertion of later material is most evident. In the Synoptics indeed Jesus comes into conflict with his countrymen, but it is avarice, greed, formalism, hypocrisy which move him; and even in Matt. xxiii., where the bitterness of the later antagonism has obscured the original utterance, beyond the word "hypocrites" the denunciation does not go. Here the tone is as cold and unloving as the phrases "liar" and "children of the devil" are extreme, and as addressed to a whole multitude, undeserved.

The hostility, bitterness, and denunciation which marked the controversies of Jew and Christian in the post-apostolic age, of which the pages of Barnabas and Justin furnish examples (Barnabas, iv., v., xiii.; Justin, *Trypho*, xii., xvi., xxv., xxvi., cxxv. f., cxxxvi.) are here carried back into the public ministry of Jesus. If this is true of the temper it is more true of the themes; it is the Johannine Christology which is under discussion, which the Jewish opponents combat, for non-acceptance of which they are refused salvation.

We may well be grateful that a truly scientific criticism removes as unhistorical this picture of a dogmatic Jesus engaging his own countrymen, with heat and malediction, in a public controversy concerning his own divinity and pre-existence.

The healing, ix. 1-12, is illustration of the theme: Jesus the Light of the world. See note after v. 41.

*Who did sin?* (ix. 2).—The presupposition is, that physical evil is the result of sin, a common Old Test. idea, found in Job; Gen. iii. If *this man* man sinned it must be either: in his mother's womb (the Rabbis discussed the question whether the ability to sin began at conception or at birth, *Sanh.*, 91); or in some pre-existent state (many believed that *all souls* were created on the sixth day with Adam and Eve). The answer of Jesus (v. 3) does not decide either question in general, but affirms of this specific instance that its final cause or purpose was that *the works of God should be made manifest in him*; the physical healing is only the minor manifestation; the greater is the Christ himself, who is revealed therein as the light of the world; v. 5.



*We must work the works of him that sent me (v. 4).*—The plural “*we*” indicates that the evangelist purposed to make a pedagogic use of the narrative ; the suffering and blindness of the world is *to the purpose* that Christians should relieve it, as Jesus does in this case ; necessity is laid upon all.

On the Logos as *light of the world (v. 5)* see comment on i. 4, 5.

*He spat on the ground (v. 6).*—The procedure is set forth in order to show how Christ did not hesitate to disregard the law, which forbade such healings (an example to Christians to pay no heed to the Jewish law) ; and to show how sudden and profound is the change wrought by Christ, from clay-covered eyes to perfect vision ; from lifelong religious darkness to complete spiritual enlightenment. Others have suggested that the clay was a means of cure ; the early interpreters found an allegorical reference to the creation of man in Gen. ii. 7, and therefore proof that he who here created from the wet clay eyes for the eyeless man is the same deity as he who there made man from the dry earth. The suggestion of the spittle came probably from Mk. viii. 23.

*Wash in the pool of Siloam (v. 7).*—The pool lay on the south-east of the city, in the valley of the Kidron. Its waters were early, perhaps in the time of Jesus, regarded as possessing medicinal virtues, as Bethesda v. 2-4. From this fact and from the command *go, wash*, indicating the ability of the man to make his way, the Rationalistic interpreters argued that the blindness was not complete and was cured by the ointment and baths. The command is often regarded as a test of faith ; no healing power was present in the water. *Siloam* is a transliteration of the Hebrew ; its correct meaning is a “ sending forth,” a “ gushing ” ; but it is here given as passive, “ sent,” whereby the evangelist makes the representation rich in allegory ; the blind man is

sent to a fountain named "sent"; the spiritually blind receives his sight from the living water of him who is the Sent of God; the gentle waters of Shilo are a symbol of God (Is. viii. 6), to whom believers come; while the command also suggests the rite of Christian baptism; Justin says of it: "the washing is illumination"; *Apol.*, i., lxi.

The representation in vv. 8-34 appears to be fashioned in accordance with a purpose to prove the reality of the stupendous wonder which reveals Christ as the light-giver; first among the neighbours, vv. 8-12, then more judiciously before the Pharisees (Jews) the identity of the man and the verity of the deed are established, and the unbelief of the Jews left without excuse. The breach of the Sabbath law is put over against the fact of the healing and thus arises division; the parents testify that the healed man is their son, but evade further responsibility; the son himself appeals to his own experience, and, waxing bold, confutes the Jews by the argument that God heareth (*i. e.*, answers by miracle the requests of) the righteous and pious only, that since this is a stupendous miracle, it shows that Jesus is superlatively righteous and pious; in this sense Jesus is surely "from God." Thus the unlettered pauper confutes the learned leaders; unable to reply, they become angry, accuse him of prenatal sin (v. 34, see v. 2), and cast him out of the synagogue, a form of excommunication which excluded one from social as well as religious privileges.

In v. 35 the marginal reading "Son of Man" is preferable, as sanctioned by Codices Sin., Vat., Bezae. On the significance, see i. 51, comment.

*And he worshipped him (v. 38).*—The verb elsewhere in John is used only for worship of deity; this is probably the case here; as the ideal faith reaches its culmination in the belief in the divinity of Jesus (so Thomas, xx. 28); the act may be one of simple homage, as Matt. ii. 2 and often. Thus culminates the Christian faith and the self-willed

blindness of Jewish unbelief ; therefore follows the solemn verdict of him who is the Light of the world in vv. 39 and 41.

*For judgment came I into this world (v. 39).*—The phrase is to be understood from the connection ; since Jesus is the Light, the result of his activity is separative ; on the judicial function of Christ as Light see iii. 19-21, comment. The result is in Biblical fashion here presented as the *purpose*.

*They which see not* are the humble, conscious of ignorance, *they which see* are the haughty, the spiritually proud, Pharisaic.

*If ye were blind ye would have no sin (v. 41).*—The preceding question of the Pharisees only reveals their self-deception ; Jesus must shatter their conceit. Therefore he says they are not blind in the sense of being humble, innocent, unskilled, unprejudiced, in which case their rejection of him would be without sin ; but they are arrogant and disdainful and therefore wilfully prejudiced, therefore their rejection is sinful and, as a result of permanent condition, must persist.

The whole chapter is a complex of historical, didactic, dogmatic, and allegorical features. The purpose is to illustrate the theme "Jesus the Light of the world" by a specific instance in which the blind man represents the moiety of the Jewish people that embraces Christianity, the Jewish Christians. They are born blind, *i. e.*, they are in the deep darkness of the perverted Judaism of their time, their cure, *i. e.*, belief in Jesus, causes commotion and opposition among their countrymen, brings them at length before the authorities, they bear testimony to their faith, are condemned and excommunicated ; religious and social fellowship are withdrawn. The sundering of the Jewish-Christian churches from the Jewish church, a process completed at or near the author's time, is here condensed into a picture. Herein is also depicted the true progress of the Christological idea ; the blind mind first regards Jesus as a prophet (v. 17), then as especially "from God" (v. 33), then, instructed by Jesus himself, as the super-earthly, pre-existent "Son of Man" (v. 35, 38, on the significance of the phrase, see i. 51, comment). The section is thus also apologetic against the Ebionitism of the time ; the true Jewish

Christian does not stop with the confession that Jesus is a man "sent of God" to be Messiah.

The historical elements are uncertain and subordinate; the absence of the narrative from the Synoptic record, though the disciples are said to be present (v. 2), is itself significant; the account of the healings in Mk. viii. 22-26; x. 46-52 and parallels evidently furnished suggestions; the narrative is constructed on the same plan as in ch. vi., since we have the same order: healing on the Sabbath, Jewish remonstrance, debate, growing hostility, crisis, confession of faith from the standpoint of the advanced Christology; the circumstantiality and so-called life-likeness are no greater than are found in the religious fiction of the second century. Wendt (*Das Johnevglm.*, 138-140) regards vv. 1, 4, 5, 39-41 as in the apostolic source, believes that the evangelist regarded it as certain that Jesus healed the victim of such misfortune, therefore completed the picture from his own invention.

Jesus as the true Door and the good Shepherd, x. 1-21.

In chap. ix. we have an illustration of the theme "Jesus the light of the world" in which the man born blind represents the true Jew as coming to the Christian faith and life for which he is destined (ix. 3), and entering the new community after expulsion from the old under the instruction of Jesus the ideal teacher, and against the efforts of the blind leaders the Pharisees; in this section the severance of the Jewish Christian believers and their relation to Christ is set forth in the form of an allegory in which the good Shepherd (Jesus) enters the (Jewish) fold and despite the false robber shepherds (Pharisees) leads out his own sheep (the chosen Jews), feeds them, protects them from wolves (religious enemies, false teachings), unites them with (Gentile) sheep of another fold, that they may become one flock (the Church Catholic), with him as the one Shepherd who lays down his life for them. Like the preceding it is polemic against the Pharisees; and as also didactic and pedagogic it is a model for the Christian teachers of the author's time.

*I say unto you* (x. 1), *i. e.*, the Pharisees; the disciples are apparently not present (ix. 35). The *fold* is the Jewish theocracy, the people as a religious community; the *thief and robber* is the Jewish religious teacher or leader, Pharisees and others like them; the *door* is here (not in vv. 7, 9)

the false methods and spirit, bondage to the letter, proselytism. The true *shepherd of the sheep* (v. 2) is Jesus. The function of the *θυρωρός*, *porter* (v. 3), was to guard at night the fold into which the many flocks had been led by their shepherds at evening and open the door for the shepherds to lead out their flocks in the morning. Since many flocks are in the fold, *i. e.*, since the Israel after the flesh is not the true Israel (so Paul, Rom. ix. 6-8), Jesus leads out his own (the chosen of Israel). The closeness of his relation and depth of his affection are set forth in the features: *the sheep hear his voice*                      *he calleth his own sheep by name,*                      *the sheep follow him*                      *they know his voice.* The divine predestination and certainty are to be found in the assertion that he puts forth *all his own*; none of the true Israel are left behind. But since Jesus is to *all* believers what he is to these, the affirmation of this loving care and intimacy may be regarded as valid for the whole Church.

*This parable* (v. 6).—The marginal rendering, “*proverb*,” is still less fitting; the *παροιμία* is a symbolic saying, an allegory; the Johannean *παροιμιαί* are usually metaphors illustrative of some office or function of Christ. The Jews, as usual, fail to understand.

*I am the door* (vv. 7, 9).—In these verses the allegory shifts. Jesus is the door which leads to the sheep. If any shepherd (teacher) enters through this door (personal appropriation of the spirit of Christ) he *shall be saved* from danger and from failure since the sheep can only pass in and out through the door, and he will therefore be able to go *in and out* and *find pasturage* for his sheep, as a shepherd should. Since the sheep must go in and out through the door, the phrase “any man” must here refer to the shepherd (teacher). These verses are probably an inserted interpretation; their purpose is to plead for an orthodox ministry to the Church; see note following v. 21.

*All that came before me are thieves and robbers (v. 8).*—This verse perhaps once immediately followed v. 5: if the meaning is: all that came to enter into the (Jewish theocratic) fold, a literal interpretation would demand that Moses, the prophets, indeed all Jewish teachers, be included in this sweeping condemnation (and Hilgenfeld therefore finds here a Gnostic rejection of the Old Test. religion): but since this would contradict the Johannean view of the old dispensation, and since the author was probably thinking of the present era, the phrase is to be taken as meaning "all who in my time, the dawn of the Messianic age," therefore describes the actual instructors of contemporary Judaism, scribes and Pharisees and lawyers (Matt. xxiii). The *sheep* who did *not hear them* are the true believers who have followed Jesus out of the Jewish fold, his own flock.

Verse 10 is connected closely with vv. 8 and 1; it contains a contrast between the false shepherds and the true; their aim is death, his is abounding life. (On the Logos as source of life see i. 4; vi. 47, comment.)

*I am the good shepherd (v. 11).*—If in vv. 1-5 the idea of Christ as the true, the legitimate shepherd is set forth, in vv. 11-18 we have an exposition of the inmost heart of the true shepherd; he is *good*, in which adjective is included the qualities of capacity, faithfulness, and above all sacrificing love, of which the supreme proof is that *he layeth down his life for the sheep*. This is set forth in unnamed opposition to the spirit of the false, unloving, cowardly shepherds, the Pharisees, and other false teachers of the author's own time.

*And I know mine own (vv. 14, 15).*—Dropping for a moment the allegory, the evangelist now describes the relation between Jesus and his disciples as one of mutual knowledge, like that existing between the Father and Son (as in Matt. xi. 27); then repeats the thought of v. 11, as to the supreme

love of the shepherd, manifested in his death in behalf of the sheep.

*And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold (v. 16).*—The *other sheep* are the Gentile Christians, wild, unshepherded before; they were not of *this* (Jewish theocratic), nor even of any flock; these are now joined with the sheep, led out (v. 3) and protected in the feeding-grounds (vv. 11-15); when they are brought together and instructed (*hear his voice*), they will become *one flock* (one Church Catholic, embracing Jews and Gentiles), *one shepherd* (Christ). Thus the allegory ends in the vision of the united Church; for the idea in Pauline circles see Eph. ii. 14-18; iv. 4-6.

Verses 17-18 contain a repetition and enlargement of the idea of the sacrifice of Christ for the Church, which is but a part of the *commandment received from the Father*, inasmuch as the taking his life again, *i. e.*, the self-resumption of heavenly life by means of resurrection and ascension, is the purpose of his laying it down, v. 17. The freedom of this action in laying down life, which therefore, contrary to appearance, was not Jewish triumph over him but his triumph over the Jews, is set forth in v. 18.

*These words (v. 19)*, in which are included all the utterances following ix. 35, caused division, as vii. 43. Verse 20 repeats viii. 48, see comment.

Both the Old Testament and the Synoptics contain much metaphor and allegory drawn from pastoral life, *e. g.*, the beautiful Psalm xxiii.; Is. xl. 11; Jer. xxiii.; Ezek. xxxiv.; Ps. lxxvii. 21; c. 3. In Matt. vii. 14 we have the narrow gate, in 15 the false teachers who are wolves; in xxv. 31 ff. the shepherd dividing sheep from goats, in Lk. xv. 4-7 the lost sheep is sought and found. In Philo the Logos is often depicted as shepherd, or the shepherd made symbol of the Logos.

The whole section x. 1-18 may have once contained two allegories now mixed, or the verses 7 and 9 may be added by the evangelist, at any rate it is probable that a more original form has been changed by

the insertion of new features in which later elements such as danger from false teachers, Gentile discipleship, church unity, a loftier Christology, have found expression.

Jesus at the feast of the Dedication; he withdraws into Perea, x. 22-42.

He reasserts his Messianic claim, his pre-existence and inmost unity with God; to escape the hostile Jews he retires into Perea.

*And it was the feast of the dedication at Jerusalem (x. 22).*—This feast was celebrated in December in honour of the reconsecration of the temple on the 25th of Chislew 165 B.C., after it had for three years been in the hands of the Syrians and been desecrated by heathen sacrifices. This feast continued for eight days; it was an occasion of joyous festivities; its most characteristic general feature was the illumination of synagogues and houses, doubled each successive evening; whence it was often called "the feast of lights"; therefore Bacon would insert, as the original order, this section x. 22-25 before the long section viii. 12-x. 16, as furnishing an occasion for the theme "Jesus the light of the world."

In the present structure of the Gospel the interval between x. 21 and 22 is about three months. No intimation of intermediate events is given; harmony with the Synoptic order is reached only by exegetical violence or mere conjecture; the author is intent only on delineating the antagonism to Jesus at this point of culmination.

On *Solomon's porch* (v. 23) see Acts iii. 11, comment; page 22 above.

*I told you and ye believe not (v. 25).*—There is no previous explicit assertion of Messiahship to Jews, but such assertion is *presupposed* in the preceding controversies; see ix. 37; for works as witness see v. 36.

*Ye are not of my sheep (v. 26).*—See vv. 2-4; 12-15; there may be a ground for the Jewish disbelief in a difference of nature.



Verses 27-30 repeat the thought of vv. 14-16 ; but add the features of the gift of eternal life (on the Son as life-giver see i. 4; vi. 39, 40, comment) and safety, grounded on the fact that believers are the gift of the Father to the Son, and since the Father is *greater than all* (in which word *all* the Son is not here included) and is one in will and power with the Son, they are doubly safe.

*I and the Father are one* (v. 30).—The assertion is to be understood from the context ; the oneness is not numerical unity, nor simple ethical accord, nor sameness of essence, though the two latter may be present by inference, but dynamic unity and therefore equality of power, since the power of the Father is in the Son, v. 19, 20.

The Jews charge that Jesus has called himself " God " or " a god."

The reply of Jesus is (vv. 34-36) that in calling God his father he has only asserted his own sonship, and that if the word " god " or " gods " was legitimately applied to those Old Test. authorities (or the heavenly council) to whom Jehovah spoke, it certainly may be proper to designate the heavenly pre-existent Messiah by the title " Son of God."

*Your law* (v. 34).—The expression is used as in viii. 17 ; it is a general designation of the Old Testament, since the quotation is from Ps. lxxxii. 6 ; where the persons addressed were probably the angels of the heavenly council (Cheyne), but are regarded as the organs of the theocracy. The antithesis is double : of person and equipment ; simple men over against a heavenly pre-existent being, a simple earthly hearing of a divine word over against a consecration in heaven by Jehovah himself ; surely a being thus sanctified and then sent into the world to save it may at least be called Son of God.

The appeal to works as ground of belief (vv. 37, 38) is a duplicate of v. 36 ; there the mission from the Father is the

true inference from the works, here they produce a conviction of the unity of Father and Son. This Christological debate with the Jews ends, as vii. 44, viii. 59, with an attempt at arrest and escape (*v.* 39).

*Again* (*v.* 40) refers back to i. 28, on which see comment.

*And many came unto him* (*v.* 41).—In this Bethany the testimony of the Baptist bears its fruit in the approach and belief of many.

Jesus the resurrection and the life—The bringing back of Lazarus from death and the grave, xi. 1-46.

Jesus, in Perea, learns of the sickness of Lazarus at Bethany, intentionally remains away until four days after his death, vv. 1-18; arrived at Bethany he converses first with Martha vv. 19-27; meets Mary vv. 28-32; goes to the tomb vv. 33-40; and after prayer calls the dead Lazarus forth into life, vv. 41-44.

This revivification is symbolic and illustrative of the theme "Jesus the life," especially as a life-giver whose power extends into another world; is also prophetically symbolic of Jesus' own death and resurrection, since in forming the impulse of the final movement which resulted in his accusation it becomes an introduction to the long description of the passion of Jesus, who is the Lamb of God, slain for men. In the great series of seven "signs" which belong to his public ministry this is final and climacteric.

*Lazarus* (xi. 1).—The name means "whom God helps," is designedly chosen; in the parable Lk. xvi. 20 he is a wretched beggar who in the underworld finds bliss but no resurrection. *Bethany* was east of Jerusalem 15 furlongs on the road to Jericho. *Martha* appears in Lk. x. 38-42, resident in a "certain village," which cannot in Luke's arrangement be in Judea, with her sister *Mary*; who in this Gospel (John xi. 2) is identical with the Mary of Matt. xxvi. 6-13, who in the house of Simon the leper anointed Jesus.

*This sickness is not unto death* (*v.* 4).—The word death is here of double meaning; for other examples see ii. 19; iii. 3, 14, 17; on the miraculous knowledge of Jesus, here shown, see ii. 18, comment, Introduction, § 2. Like the congenital

blindness of ix. 3 this illness has as its special purpose the common glory of the Father and the Son, see xiii. 31.

*Therefore* (v. 6) is in resumption of v. 4. Jesus remained away two days, not because he loved the family, but that he and the Father might be glorified; he knows that Lazarus is dying or dead, vv. ii. 14, 17; he can neither be hastened by friends, nor restrained by disciples, vv. 3, 8.

*Are there not twelve hours in the day?* (v. 9).—The emphasis lies upon the word *twelve*; it is for Jesus not yet the last hour; it may be the eleventh; while the day lasts, *i. e.*, while his hour has not yet come (see vii. 20; viii. 30; ix. 4; comment) he need not hesitate at danger; when the time of his Messianic activity is over, will come the stumbling should one attempt to defy the will of God that the day is for labour.

*Our friend Lazarus sleepeth* (v. 11).—The euphonism is as old as Homer, is found in the Old Testament; became specially prominent among the early Christians, apparently through the use of the Pauline letters. Since a journey from Perea to Bethany for the purpose of rousing an invalid from sleep would be chimerical, the inability of the disciples to understand the assertion: *I go, that I may awaken him out of sleep*, must be regarded as especially artificial, due to the often manifest purpose to represent Jesus as constantly misunderstood; ii. 22; iii. 3; iv. 10; xiii. 36; xvi. 18.

*Ye may believe* (v. 15).—The verb indicates ideal or completed faith; the disciples had need of more unshaken confidence; the miracle is for the disciples' sake.

*Thomas called Didymus* (v. 16).—The word Didymus (twin) may mean "double (minded)," *i. e.*, doubter. He is sometimes identified with Judas of James.

*So when Jesus came* (v. 17).—The journey "from Bethany to Bethany" would not occupy more than two days, might be accomplished in one. The nearness of Bethany to Jerusalem is stated (v. 18) so as to explain the fact that many of

the Jews shared in the mourning of the sisters for their brother (which continued seven days) and were therefore present at this greatest of the miracles.

The difference of the sisters (v. 20) appears in Lk. x. 38-42.

*My brother had not died (v. 21).*—The confidence is not in the skill of Jesus as physician, but in his miraculous power, which in the following verse appears as a gift from God in answer to prayer ; but in this verse there is not, as Meyer asserts, a suggestion or hope of a resurrection or revivification, as is proven by verses 24, 39.

*Thy brother shall rise again (v. 23).*—Here is again the usual misunderstanding ; Jesus can only mean, after v. 11, that this is to take place *at once* ; Martha, that it is to occur at the end of the age when the days of Messiah are ushered in, or, if the author represent Martha as having the early Christian belief, the time when the crucified and ascended Jesus Christ shall return from heaven ; as vi. 39, 40 ; see comment.

*I am the resurrection and the life (v. 25).*—The emphasis lies upon the word “I.” In v. 24 Martha thinks of the resurrection as distant, and vaguely connects it with the powers of a new age. Here is emphasised the connection of the person of Jesus with that life. He is the principle of the resurrection, because this principle is eternal life, and *in him was life*. This life is thus the cause of the resurrection, since it is an indwelling potency in the present life, remains in the soul of the believer at bodily death, and becomes at the last day the instrument and means of an entrance into a new order of being.

The paradox in twofold form (vv. 25, 26) contains the favourite use of terms in a double sense : the word “die” refers in v. 25 to bodily death, in v. 26 to spiritual : the word “live” in v. 26 is used in physical, in v. 25 in spiritual sense. As to the paradox itself see comment on v. 29, 30.

The future tense in v. 25 (ἐήσεται, *he shall live*) indicates that the emphasis lies upon eternal life considered as consummated at and by means of the resurrection, not as present possession; while in the following verse the converse is true of ἀποθάνη (die).

Since this life is promised (a) to *all* who believe, since it is promised as (b) *present*, since it is promised (c) as permanent, it follows that the passage contains no reference to the *resuscitated earthly life of Lazarus*, which was *exceptional*, then future, transient. These verses (25-27) apparently are an excerpt from some source.

Martha's confession of faith (v. 27) is of the Johannine type; for the significance of its phrases, see comment on i. 34; x. 36. In this confession the doctrinal interest finds its goal; the narrative turns to Mary.

The words : *the master calleth thee* (v. 28) are to be considered as insertion from a tradition where the call for Mary was included as a feature of some import; it is here without significance.

*He groaned in the spirit* (v. 33).—The marginal rendering is preferable : *was moved with indignation in the spirit*; and *troubled himself*. The verb ἐμβριμάομαι denotes a stern, indignant frame of mind; here is no simple passive emotion of grief; the presence of the weeping sisters and especially of the weeping unbelieving Jews who have no faith in him as lord of life and death rouses him to the utmost; there is no evidence that the Jews were hypocritical in their weeping; or that the object of Jesus' indignation was either death or Satan.

*Jesus wept* (v. 35).—The verb used (here only in the N. T.) denotes a silent fall of tears, not lamentation; in v. 33 there is indignation because of unbelief.

*Behold how he loved him* (v. 36).—It accords better with the general characterisation of the Jews in this Gospel to regard this exclamation as ironical and depreciative : Behold

how great his love was, just enough to moisten the eyes, not to cause lamentation (*κλαίειν*) ; it is usually considered as a concession wrung from hostility.

To this sneer at small affection is now added one at the want of power in Jesus (v. 37), at which Jesus is again moved with indignation (v. 38).

*Martha, the sister of him that was dead* (v. 39).—The phrase of apparent introduction is peculiar after vv. 1, 3, 5, 21, 23, and indicates a different source. The statement: *he stinketh*, is only an inference from the length of time which had elapsed since the death of Lazarus ; but no conclusion against such a fact is to be urged because the utterance precedes the opening of the tomb ; this feature is inserted to show the stupendous character of the miracle ; the reason given: *he hath been dead four days*, is of importance to the author, since according to some Jewish Rabbis the soul did not definitely or finally leave the body until the fourth day ; whence many ancients believed that the soul of Lazarus actually descended to Hades, and antiquity knew of a "book of Lazarus" in four parts, in which he recounted his underworld experiences.

The reply of Jesus (v. 40) does not refer to v. 4, but perhaps to vv. 23, 25 ; more probably to some omitted portion of a written source, where belief was a condition of miracle, as is not the case in this Gospel.

*I thank thee that thou heardest me* (v. 41).—The hearing by the Father is to be connected with the assurances of vv. 4 and 11 ; Jesus foreknew what he was to do (or what the Father would do through him), therefore the explanation of the prayer of gratitude is given in the following verse (42), which declares the act as in itself unnecessary since the Logos-Christ is conscious of complete unity with the Father, but useful to men who would know thereby that the miracle was from a divine rather than a demonic source, and thus believe that the miracle-worker was *sent from God*. It can

with difficulty be denied that the dogmatic conception of the evangelist has here reduced the sublime act of communion to the lower level of mere utility ; it is hardly more than a " display-prayer " to which we listen.

*He cried* (v. 43), is more correctly "*he shouted*," either as a means of recalling Laazrus to life, or to attract the multitude.

The feature of the bound limbs and blinded eyes (v. 44) is inserted to show the magnitude of the miracle ; the coming forth is an upward movement through the air, representative of the future resurrection at the Parousia.

It cannot be questioned that the raising of Lazarus is in the most important elements of its presentation an allegory representative of the great theme of the Gospel : Jesus is the giver of eternal life. As to the problem of the historical elements contained in it opinions widely differ. (a) The absence of the section from the Synoptic tradition creates a grave difficulty. Since in it the disciples are represented as with Jesus, its non-insertion is not therefore satisfactorily explained as due to the ignorance of Synoptic authors, or their desire to shield the family at Bethany until the death of Lazarus (which according to the tradition of later centuries occurred about thirty years after his resurrection), or their deliberate purpose to exclude Judean incidents, since they narrate in such detail the events at Jerusalem. (b) The narrative in its present form is in part derived from Synoptic material or tradition akin to it, Lk. x. 38-42 ; xvi. 19-31. (c) One purpose of the delineation is apparently to illustrate the statement of Lk. xvi. 30 that even if Lazarus were sent to the Jews from the dead they would not believe, since while some of those present are momentarily affected, the miracle only moves the nation to more stubborn resistance and becomes a prominent cause of the death of Jesus. (d) The purpose of aggrandisement is very apparent ; the delineation is a superlative, while that of the widow's son at Nain is a comparative, and that of the daughter of Jairus is a positive (Mk. v. 22-43 ; Lk. vii. 12-17) ; as to the age : child, youth, man ; as to the place : (1) dying bed, (2) bier and the road to burial, (3) tomb ; as to time and condition : (1) the hour of dying and uncertainty as to actual death : "the damsel is not dead but sleepeth" ; (2) the day, not the hour, of death ; body and soul still united (see xi. 39 comment) ; (3) four days

dead, body and soul parted, bodily decay begun; as respects the marvel: (1) the girl, lifted up by the hand of Jesus, walks; (2) the youth, at the touch of Jesus upon the bier, though swathed for burial, sits up and speaks; (3) Lazarus, at the mere word of Jesus, though bound hand and foot, comes forth from the tomb as if lifted from the earth; as respects publicity: Jesus (1) is alone in a private room in Capernaum; (2) is on a highway near Nain in southern Galilee; (3) is before a throng of Jews in Bethany near Jerusalem, the capital, the seat of unbelief. The climax cannot be accidental. (e) The presence of circumstantiality and naturalness in the delineation is not to be denied, but the same features are to be found in the late and unhistorical traditions of the apocryphal lives of Christ and deeds of the apostles (see Drummond, *The Character of the Fourth Gospel*, 376 ff). (f) The section as we have it is dependent upon some written source or sources (see comment on vv. 23-27); and displays the characteristics so often met with in the historical writings of Scripture: a strict adhesion to the very verbiage of the source curiously combined with free insertion of imaginative elements.

The whole evidence points strongly toward the conclusion that the evangelist, using some tradition to us unknown and the Synoptic material mentioned, elaborated them freely into a narrative designed to be at once: (a) an astounding manifestation of the power of the Logos-Christ, (b) a pictorial setting forth of the spiritual truth of the Christ as Life, (c) a prophetic prefiguration of the death and resurrection of Jesus, as shown by the facts that the names Jesus and Lazarus have the same meaning and that the narrative forms a transition to the final struggle and to death, and (d) since the cleansing of the temple is in John placed far away at the beginning of the public ministry, an explanation of the chief immediate cause of the apprehension and condemnation of Jesus, xi. 45, 48; xii. 9, 10, 17-19.

**The Sanhedrin purpose the arrest and death of Jesus, xi. 47-57.**

The last of the "*many signs*" (v. 47) leads the enemies of Jesus to a new apprehension and a fresh impulse to proceed against Jesus.

*All men will believe on him (v. 48): i. e., will accept him as Messiah, and in the resulting revolution the Romans will take from the Jews both their land and national existence.*

*Caiaphas (v. 49).*—Joseph Caiaphas, son-in-law of Annas



xviii. 13, was high-priest from 18-36 A.D., therefore the phrase "*that year*" (repeated v. 51 and xviii. 13) finds its most natural explanation in the supposition that the evangelist regarded the office as an annual one as in Asia Minor (Mommsen, *Rom. Gesch.*, v. 318); the explanation that the design was to call especial attention to *that year* as ever memorable is less satisfactory, especially as respects the repetitions; the curious formalities of vv. 49-52 and xviii. 13 f. point to use of a special source.

Since Caiaphas means "diviner, soothsayer" (Nestle, *Zeits. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1897, i., 149; on the stem see Schürer, *Gesch. des jüd. Volkes*, ii., 167), he appears in the following verses as prophet. Like Balaam, Numb. xxiii. 5, he is made an instrument of Jehovah, who puts a word into his mouth.

*It is expedient for you that one man should die for the people and that the whole nation perish not (v. 50).*—The double sense of the passage lies in the use of the two words λαός and ἔθνος, *people* and *nation*. In the *thought of the high-priest* they are identical; in the *deeper and true sense*, hidden from the speaker who is an unconscious prophet, the word λαός means the *whole community of Christians*, Jew and Gentile, the *children of God* of v. 52; this is the significance which λαός developed in Christian circles and is found in later New Test. writings, see Heb. iv. 9; 1 Peter ii. 9, 10; Titus ii. 14; Rev. xviii. 4. For this people Jesus died.

*Now this he said not of himself (v. 51).*—This Caiaphas ("diviner," see v. 49, comment) was high-priest; the high-priest was in law and tradition the instrument of divine revelation; in verse 52 there is an antithesis of *nation* and *children of God* but it is not to be understood that the nation signifies Jews (or Jewish Christians) and that the children of God are Gentiles only. The high-priest prophesied that Jesus was to die that the *nation* might be preserved from insurrection and subsequent dissolution by the Romans; this was his *conscious* meaning; the *unconscious*

prophecy was that Jesus was to die for the people (the whole community of Christians, see v. 50, comment), the *children of God*, and gather them, now scattered abroad, into one body ; the passage is a parallel of x. 16 ; the antithesis is of a part against the whole, as if one should say : the tutor instructed not the eldest son only but all the children.

*Now the Passover of the Jews was at hand (v. 55).*—Since the former visit to Jerusalem (x. 22) some three months had elapsed.

This session of the council, vv. 47-53, is the Johannine parallel of Mk. xiv. 55-64 ; this Gospel narrates no session of the Sanhedrin on Passover week ; at this session the death of Jesus has already been agreed upon.

Jesus is anointed at Bethany, xii. 1-11.

As the raising of Lazarus is prophetically symbolic of Jesus' death and resurrection, and the word of Caiaphas an unconscious prophetic interpretation of the significance of that death, so the anointing by Mary is an unconscious but solemn prophetic preparation for, and symbol of, the same events. In the Synoptic narrative the anointing occurs on the second day before the Passover, Mk. xiv. 1-9 ; as placed here before the Messianic demonstration, the prophetic prescience appears more remarkable.

*Six days before the Passover (xii. 1).*—If the Passover begin on the 15th Nisan, the sixth day previous would be the 10th or 9th ; if the feast begin on the 14th, the entrance would be one day earlier. Since in the Johannean chronology, the crucifixion occurred on Friday the 14th of Nisan, the probability is that the day here mentioned is the 9th, Sunday ; inasmuch as on the preceding day (Saturday, the Jewish Sabbath) travel was not allowed. But it is possible that Saturday or even Friday was the day indicated. The specific mention is for the purpose of indicating the undoubted pre-knowledge of Jesus concerning his death.

*They made him a supper (v. 2).*—In Mk. xiv. 3 the feast is in the house of Simon the leper ; some consider Simon as

father of the Bethany group, or husband of *Martha who served*, as Lk. x. 40; but Lazarus appears as guest.

*Mary took a pound of ointment of spikenard (v. 3).*—In Lk. x. 39 Mary as a devoted follower is at the feet of Jesus. The amount of the ointment is given here (not in the Synoptics) to indicate the richness of the affection; the brother had been restored to life; that the whole quantity was used is implied in the objection of Judas, vv. 4-6. The anointing the feet (in Mk. xiv. 3, and Matt. xxvi. 6 the ointment is poured over the head) and wiping the ointment off with the hair come from Luke's account of an anointing by a sinful woman in Capernaum (Lk. vii. 36-50), where the feet are dried with the hair before the application of the ointment. The anointing was a special luxury

*As to Judas Iscariot (v. 5)*, see xiii. 21, comment. The "some" of Mk. xiv. 4 who were indignant at the waste are here replaced by the greedy Judas; they were falsely economical, he is dishonest and hypocritical. In v. 7 the reading of the margin is to be preferred, since according to vv. 3, 5 the ointment was apparently all used, and since there is no mention of an anointing by Mary at the burial; it is Joseph and Nicodemus who prepare the body for the tomb, xix. 38-40. The departure of Jesus, determined and near, is here already regarded as taking place; since Mary is not to see him again this is her unconscious preparation of his body for burial.

Verse 8 is from Mk. xiv. 7, or similar source; the thought is that this special opportunity to manifest love may justly take precedence of the general duty to manifest love by charity; the Son of God departs soon.

The evident dependence of the narrative on the two sources, Mk. xiv. 1-9, and Lk. vii. 36-50, betrays the absence of the eye-witness. In Luke the place is Capernaum, the time soon after the choice of the twelve and the sermon (Lk. vii. 1); the woman is apparently a poor sinner, who must use her hair for a towel; the ointment is not said to be costly; the feet are anointed, since the outcast woman may not venture to disturb the recumbent guest: all these are Lucan features

descriptive of Jesus the friend of sinners. In Mark the place is Bethany; the time is after the triumphal entry, two days before the final Passover; the house is that of Simon the (healed) leper; the grateful woman is apparently no sinner but one of the family of Simon; her simple deed of grateful love is made a symbol of preparation for the death which Jesus foresees after the hostility produced by his cleansing of the temple and denouncing the scribes and Pharisees. In John the feast precedes the triumphal entry, since already the death of Jesus is decreed; the prescience of Jesus is thereby magnified; the woman is no sinner, since Jesus is not in this Gospel presented as in special familiarity with the lower classes, but the Mary of a family evidently prosperous; the value of the ointment is large; it is poured upon the feet, as in Luke, to indicate the superior dignity of Christ, but the chasm is here metaphysical rather than moral or social; Judas, who is more prominent than in the Synoptics, is the objector to the waste of the ointment.

**The entrance into Jerusalem, xii. 12-19.**

The report concerning the raising of Lazarus is circulated among the throng who have come up to the Passover feast, and causes a multitude to come out from Jerusalem to meet Jesus as he enters the city and salute him as the king of Israel. This is a prototype of the heavenly greeting of the slain and ascended Lamb-king upon his throne, Rev. vii. 9.

The entrance to death is also one into heavenly glory.

*On the morrow (v. 12).*—See comment on v. 1.

*The branches of the palm trees (v. 13).*—Here is a more specific statement than the Synoptic; the palm was a symbol of prosperity, its branches used in celebration of victory; 1 Mk. xiii. 51; Rev. vii. 9. From this feature comes our term: Palm Sunday.

*Hosanna*: literally "save," "be propitious," in common use as a shout of joyful greeting; the remainder of the verse is a combination of Mk. xi. 9 and Lk. xix. 38; the king is Messiah.

*Jesus, having found a young ass, sat thereon (v. 14).*—The description omits the deliberate preparation made according to the Synoptic account, Mk. xi. 1-6, and parallels; the

quotation is from Zech. ix. 9, freely cited ; see also Zeph. iii. 16; this citation may come directly from Matt. xxi. 5. The narrative conveys the impression that the act of Jesus in finding the ass's colt was the result of a purpose formed after he met the multitude rendering Messianic homage ; he does this, as he says, " I thirst," xix. 28, that prophecy may be fulfilled.

*These things (v. 16)* refer to the entry and especially the riding the ass in their typical and prophetic significance ; herein and not in their influence upon the course of the events of the week lies their chief import. For another instance of later comprehension of an event enigmatic at its occurrence see ii. 22.

The mention of the two multitudes, in *vv. 17, 18*, one of which bears witness to the raising of Lazarus, the other believing on Jesus by virtue of the evidence of the first, and the citation of the despairing cry of the Pharisees in *v. 19*, are inserted to bring into more prominence the idea that the death of Jesus was due to no accidental cause, but that it was because of a divine determination, which he had known from the beginning and to which he conformed his earthly course, that he outwardly succumbs to the attacks of his enemies ; see ii. 18-22 ; xviii. 6, 11. This hour is of triumph as well as fate. Even the Pharisees become prophets, as did the high-priest xi. 49-52, and see his victory ; *Lo the world is gone after him.*

The Johannine narrative differs from the Synoptic in many details and in its significance. In the Synoptic the entrance is on the afternoon of the day on which Jesus leaves Jericho (Mk. x. 46 ; xi. 1, 11), the multitude are Galileans, strangers to Jerusalem, as is also Jesus (Matt. xxi. 10, 11), the cause of the Messianic homage is the prophetic activity in Galilee, Jesus himself pre-arranges details (Mk. xi. 1-7). In John Jesus sets out from Bethany ; the multitudes come from Jerusalem and consist in part at least of residents ; the cause of the Messianic homage is the Lazarus miracle ; the homage is suddenly thrust upon him and he yields to it only that Scripture may be fulfilled.

There is a difference in setting and significance: in the Synoptics, despite the prophecy of death (Mk. x. 32-34) there is still manifest the bold venture of the Galilean prophet Messiah to secure his position and claims at Jerusalem, and as the first step of such a purpose it is followed by the cleansing of the temple and the acrid disputations whereby the subsequent hatred and fatal attack find a sufficient historical explanation. In John, since the cleansing reformatory act lies years away (ii. 13-16), since death by the Jews was foreknown from the first (ii. 18-21), since Jerusalem has long since rejected Jesus (viii. 59), and he has already been anointed for burial (xii. 1-11), the entrance becomes a simple fulfilment of prophecy or a symbol, it remains without effect; there is no subsequent public activity of Jesus as in the Synoptics, only tender farewells with his disciples; the artificiality of the Lazarus miracle as a motive for Messianic belief is shown by the fact that the homage of the multitude produces no effect but remains also a mere fulfilment of prophecy.

**The Greeks seek Jesus, xii. 20-36.**

The entrance into Jerusalem, a prototype of the entrance into the heavenly Jerusalem through the death which furthers the victory over the world, is now made more significant as type by the inquiry of the Greeks. Since the earthly activity of Jesus was confined to his own people, his death is his glorification; for through it he will be able to communicate eternal life to the Gentile world. This seeking by Gentiles is a sign that his hour has come; if it is death for him it is life for them; it is the crucial hour: if for a moment there is a shadow of hesitation the Father's voice removes it; in the decision Satan is vanquished and all men, Jew and Gentile, are drawn to the Christ lifted up from the earth.

*Certain Greeks (xii. 20)*: proselytes, since they came to worship Jehovah.

*Philip (v. 21)*: see i. 44, comment; it was not until 84 A.D. that the region in which Bethsaida lay was included in Galilee.

*Andrew (v. 22)*: see i. 40; both these disciples have Greek names and appear together in vi. 7, 8. In second century tradition Philip was an apostle to the Gentiles, resident at Hierapolis; he led the Greeks to Jesus.

*The hour is come (v. 23)*.—The tidings of the inquiry by the Greeks is accepted by Jesus as a certain indication that

nothing remains save death and the subsequent glorification whereby he should bring eternal life to the Gentiles; see introduction to this section. On *the Son of Man* see i. 51, comment.

*Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth (v. 24).*—The earthly body of Jesus is the perishing grain of wheat; the life germ departs from it and is embodied in many living seeds or plants, the great world of believers, Jew and Gentile. Only when it dies can the seed give life; all the world is to be drawn to the glorified Jesus, v. 32. This also is the law for the disciples (v. 25); see Mk. viii. 35, where also the thought is connected with coming death. The paradox lies in the word *ψυχή*; it is the organ and bearer both of the sensuous and of the spiritual life; he who loveth his soul as the organ of the lower, sensual life loses it as the organ of the spirit; he who hates it in this (pre-Messianic) world shall preserve it to be the organ of the eternal life of the age to come.

*Let him follow me (v. 26)*: let him imitate me in this free surrender of the earthly self; this is followed by the promise: *where I am*, etc.; where Jesus is in glory, there (at death if a martyr, otherwise at the Parousia) will his servant be. See Mk. viii. 34-38.

*Now is my soul troubled (v. 27).*—Over the *ψυχή*, this bearer of the earthly life, passes the shadow of cloud; this hour of the triumphal entrance is also the Gethsemane of the Johannine Son of Man; here in the presence of the Greeks is the time of decision or of the evident certainty of the earthly fate that awaits. The words: *Father, save me from this hour*, are to be regarded as interrogative; Jesus asks whether he shall thus pray; it is a petition suggested but not offered; see xi. 41, 42. The *hour* is the time of crucifixion and death, conceived as present in this moment of solemn determination; the inward pang is lessened when the will yields to the divine purpose.

*Glorify thy name (v. 28).*—Self is forgotten, only the Father's glory remains as goal. The death on the cross is the glorification of Jesus, vii. 39, since it is a part of the process of the exaltation; this glorification brings to the Father added glory.

The responding voice (of the Father) from heaven now assures Jesus both of the victory of his life and the greater triumph of his death; behind him lies the glory (*δόξα*) of his presence (i. 14), his words and deeds, before him the glory of the death and exaltation; both glorify the Father. The *voice* is not to be rationalistically explained as an unexpected peal of thunder, interpreted by Jesus as an answer to his prayer; the intention is to represent as in error both those who said *that it thundered* and those who said that an angel spoke to him: it was the Father's voice, familiar to him alone who knew the Father. So in the glorification of the transfiguration, Mk. ix. 7, the Father's voice is heard. But so close is the union between the Father and the Son that the answer of the Father is not needed by the Son (v. 30); it is for the sake of the people; as the prayer of xi. 41, 42.

*Now is the judgment of this world (v. 31).*—The emphasis lies upon the word *now*; the determination is the ideal end, in which the fulfilment of the determination (x. 18), the actual death, is included. The judgment begun already (see iii. 18-20, comment) now culminates. *This world* is the lower, earthly; since it is under the prince of the world, and is to be overcome, *in principle*, by the death of Christ, it is here the equivalent of the word "age" (*αἰών*) which is only used adverbially in John. This age comes to its end, ideally, in the death and exaltation of Jesus, whereby he becomes the regnant spiritual power; the *prince of this world* (age) *will be thus cast out*; he was the ruling power (*θεός* in 2 Cor. iv. 4); he will be brought to judgment, xvi. 11, and expelled from his domain.



*And I, if I be lifted up out of the earth, etc. (v. 32).*—The verse is the antithesis of the preceding in one respect : the person of Christ is set strongly over against that of Satan, the prince of this world ; the defeat of the one is the triumph of the other. This victory of Christ has, however, its condition. He must be *lifted up out of the earth*, exalted to heaven ; on the meaning of the verb *ὑψωθῆναι* see iii. 14, comment. Since Christ is thus lifted up into heavenly places, the drawing is a drawing toward heaven ; it is more than the continuance of the influence of his earthly life. The Prince of the powers of the air has been expelled ; in his place, as spiritual ruler of the world, Christ is enthroned. The phrase *all men* denotes not simply Jews and Gentiles, but the totality of both ; codex Bezae has *πάντα*, all things.

Verse 33 is the evangelist's interpretation of v. 32 ; see iii. 14.

*We have heard out of the law, etc (v. 34).*—The word law here means the Old Testament ; the passages may be Is. ix. 6 ; Ps. cx. 4.

The question of the people implies that Jesus had called himself the Son of Man ; in the evangelist's thought they are the persons who heard iii. 14 and viii. 28. To the demand for explanation no concession is made (*vv. 35, 36*) ; a solemn warning testifies that the goal is reached. On the phrase *hid himself* see viii. 59, comment.

In the Synoptic narrative the entrance into Jerusalem is followed by the cleansing of the temple, here by the picture of the Greeks seeking Jesus ; there the bold Messiah-reformer, the huzzas of Galilean adherents in his ears, begins his activity at Jerusalem with a deed of defiance ; here the world-Saviour, conqueror and victim, already rejected at the Jewish capital, sees in the inquiring Greeks led to him the symbol of the beginning of the process by which, through his death and exaltation, the earthly limitations of his saving power shall be cast aside, the spiritual prince of the world be overthrown, and all men drawn to himself.

Here, as elsewhere, only the ideal is of importance ; the Greeks are

like Nicodemus, a symbol ; whether they even saw Jesus we cannot discover ; they disappear without remark, only the figure of the Son of Man remains. The moment contains, in idea, the significance of many Synoptic scenes ; in its prevision of a near death it is Gethsemane, Mk. xiv. 32-42 ; in its prophetic foreglance at the entrance of the Gentiles it is the joy of Jesus at Satan's fall from heaven, Lk. x. 17, 18 ; in its vision of a new glory for Jesus through death it is the Transfiguration, Lk. ix. 28-31. Features from these three Synoptic passages are here combined with characteristic modifications ; compare v. 27 with Mk. xiv. 35 ; v. 28 with Mk. xiv. 36 ; v. 31 with Lk. x. 18 ; v. 32 with Lk. x. 22 ; v. 28 with Lk. ix. 31 (here to "glorify again" means the "decease at Jerusalem") ; vv. 28-30 (the sustaining voice from heaven) with Lk. xxii. 43.

The concluding judgment ; the final testimony to the world, xii. 37-50.

As Jesus thus closes his public activity as teacher, the result of his activity in word and deed, and the significance of his testimony and of his person, are summed up : first, in a word of the evangelist, showing this result to be the fulfilment of prophecy, then in a word of Jesus himself setting forth in a brief summary the chief elements of his public utterances as a final testimony.

*So many signs (v. 37).*—The evangelist has presented seven as types, but asserts the reality of many more, vii. 31 ; xi. 47 ; xx. 30. Their failure to win the Jews is now explained. The unbelief has its ground in a divine determinism (on which see vi. 44, comment) and is a fulfilment of prophecy.

The first citation (v. 38) is Is. liii. 1, in which the speaker is the exilic prophet whose word is despised ; in the use here made the prophet Jesus speaks ; the word *report* refers to his utterances ; the phrase *arm of the Lord* to his deeds of power.

The second (vv. 39, 40) is Is. vi. 9, 10, where the prophet is commanded by Jehovah to make the people obdurate and unbelieving, lest they should turn and find healing : here the result is represented as reached ; the connection requires that the subject of the verb "*hath blinded*" be construed as

God. In both the original and the quotation the actual result is regarded as the sequence of a divine decree.

A summary of the word of this rejected prophet, this Son of Man; the origin, substance, purpose, of his testimony, now completes this section of the Gospel (vv. 44-50). The verses repeat in substance former utterances; for *v.* 44 see viii. 19, 42; for *v.* 45 see i. 18; viii. 19; for *v.* 46 see iii. 19; viii. 12; ix. 5; for *v.* 47 see iii. 17; for *v.* 48 see iii. 18; viii. 50; for *v.* 49 see vii. 16, 17; viii. 28, 38; for *v.* 50 see references to *v.* 49 and vi. 63, 68.

It is agreed by even conservative commentators like Luthardt that the section, vv. 43-48, "entirely without connection, without location, without new thoughts," is a cento derived from preceding sayings, and was here put into the mouth of Jesus so as to complete the part of the Gospel devoted to the public ministry.

The section is the Johannine equivalent for the material contained in Mk. xi. 27-xiii. 44, Matt. xxi. 23-xxiii. 39; both are final, but each in its way; the local, national, and temporal features of the Synoptic teaching meet no interest or need of the author of the Logos gospel, who writes especially for the great Gentile church of his time; the last public utterance is therefore no stern denunciation of Scribe and Pharisee, as in Matt. xxiii; the close no pathetic wail over a Jerusalem hastening to ruin (Matt. xxiii. 37-39), but a last loud call to hear and heed him who came to save a world (John xii. 47).

#### Part II. Jesus the heavenly High-priest, xiii. 1-xvii. 26.

Jesus, the great High-priest, about to enter heaven by the sacrifice of himself, prepares his people: he cleanses them by the solemn ceremony of the foot-washing, xiii. 1-20, and the exclusion of the traitor, xiii. 21-30; sanctifies them by the last and highest gift of his word concerning truth and duty, xiii. 31-xvi. 33; intercedes for them with the Father, xvii. 1-26.

Jesus washes the disciples' feet, xiii. 1-20.

Jesus, as host at this final supper with his disciples, sets forth the true spirit of this new kingdom by a hospitable act of loving service. As high-priest of this kingdom, he rises from the feast, girds himself with the towel as a symbol of the true priestly spirit, and purifies his chosen as a solemn preparation for his departure and their coming trial.

*Now before the feast of the Passover*, etc. (xiii. 1).—The Passover had already been mentioned, xii. 1. Since this supper is the last meal (see xiii. 26, 30, 38 ; xvi. 32 ; xviii. 1, 3, 27, 28) and the crucifixion took place on the day before the Sabbath (xviii. 28) as the resurrection on Sunday (xx. 1), it follows that the author conceived this last meeting as taking place on the evening of the thirteenth of Nisan, and thus represents Jesus as crucified on the fourteenth, and dying about the time when the Passover meal was being prepared, the chosen lambs were being slain.

That this meal was not the Passover meal is shown by the facts (a) that its characteristic features are nowhere mentioned ; (b) that the evangelist represents Jesus as washing the disciples' feet during supper (vv. 2, 12), while participants in the Passover bathed the whole body before coming to the table ; (c) that while the Passover meal was a solemn service of acts liturgically united so that retirement or conversation were inadmissible, in this meal there were interruptions and conversations. The Synoptics as clearly represent the last meal as the Passover meal, eaten therefore on the evening of the fourteenth of Nisan. This difference is to be recognised and left unadjusted ; the attempt of Luthardt to reconcile the two accounts by asserting that in xviii. 28 reference is made to a meal eaten on the afternoon or in the evening of the fifteenth of Nisan is an act of exegetical violence.

The knowledge of Jesus that *his hour was come* is no less clear than that it had not come in ii. 4 and vi. 7 ; miraculous prescience. *His own* are not only the twelve, but present and future believers, xvii. 20.

On *Judas Iscariot* (v. 2) see vv. 21-30 and note following v. 30.

*The Father had given all things into his hands* (v. 3).—This repetition of iii. 35 is here inserted to make it clear that the death of Jesus was not forced upon him, was given into his own hand. The *coming from God* and *going to God* are the incarnation and the exaltation ; they are not spiritual experiences ; they are acts of the pre-existent Son of Man. See iii. 2, comment.

Jesus *riseth from supper* (v. 4).—Evidently the meal was in progress, therefore not the Passover meal, see v. 1, comment. The specific mention of the steps of the process is for the purpose of emphasis; Jesus dresses himself for the service of a slave, this is his high-priestly costume, on assumption of which he performs the slave's function of washing the disciples' feet (v. 5).

*Thou shalt understand hereafter* (v. 7).—The act is a formal preparation for parting with the disciples; Peter would know its meaning when the events of those days lay behind him; since he does not now comprehend, and is, like John in Matt. iii. 14, conscious of the superiority of Jesus, he refuses such menial service from him.

*If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me* (v. 8).—Since this is a final and complete purification, preparatory to the departure of Jesus and the fate of the disciples left behind, the whole group must be included; since the act is symbolic of utter self-surrender and service, Peter must be equally prepared to recognise it in Jesus and to display it by surrender of his own will respecting this service, else he has no share with Jesus. But Peter misunderstands the demand, in his conception of the act as simple externality he requests a bathing of the entire body (v. 9).

*He that is bathed*, etc. (v. 10).—After the complete bath in the stream the feet become soiled by contact with the banks and the road; therefore the allegory: the disciples had been cleansed by Jesus' word, xv. 3; now it is only necessary as a final purification to wash away the minor stains of recent personal contact with the world.

The addition: *ye are clean, but not all*, explained in v. 11 as referring to Judas, indicates that the allegory is also to be understood collectively: the disciples are the bathed body, Judas the unclean feet.

In vv. 12-20 there follows an explanation of the significance to be attached to this service. This follows a resumption of the seat at

the table-couch; the fact of the purifying character of the deed is made less conspicuous than the personal relation and position of the doer.

The argument of vv. 13-16 is from the greater to the less: if the great teacher condescend to such service, surely his pupils should not regard themselves as too exalted for it. The command of v. 14 is regarded by many Christians as to be literally carried out, see note after v. 20. Verse 16 finds its parallels in Matt. x. 24; xv. 20; Lk. vi. 40, with different applications. Verses 18, 19 are to be regarded as insertion by the evangelist into some received written source; Jesus knows, as his hearers cannot, the character of Judas. The quotation of v. 18 is Ps. xli. 9, where the speaker is Israel and the treacherous friend some adjacent nation; its application to Jesus and Judas is here less fitting, since according to vi. 70, 71 Jesus had not trusted Judas from the first; the apparent confidence was only for the more exact completion of prophecy and the divine decree. Verse 20, which is apparently from Matt. x. 40, continues the general theme of sending and sent in v. 16.

In place of the institution of the Lord's Supper, the significance of which had been presented in vi. 51-58, the evangelist inserts this narrative of the feet-washing. He probably had before him some written source. In Luke's account of the events of the last evening, the institution of the Supper is immediately followed by a dispute among the disciples concerning rank, which Jesus quiets by reference to his own example: "*whether is greater, he that sitteth at meat or he that serveth? . . . I am among you as he that serveth,*" Lk. xxii. 24-30. The beautiful simile has here become a touching transaction, filled with allegorical features. For Synoptic material or parallels see Matt. x. 24, 40; xv. 20; Lk. xii. 27. The absence of the incident from the Synoptic narrative, and the absence of evidence that such a custom or institution existed in the first two centuries, furnish additional evidence that we have here an idea transformed into an action. After the third century the custom of foot-washing as a rite became wide-spread; in the Greek Church it has become a sacrament, but is non-obligatory; it is sometimes practised in the

Roman Catholic Church ; it was set aside by the reformers ; but is observed by some minor Protestant sects.

Jesus points out the traitor, xiii. 21-30.

The purifying and condescending act of Jesus only makes the selfish baseness of Judas more glaring ; the decision ripens. The pointing out of the traitor and his exclusion by a command of Jesus from the circle of the disciples completes the priestly act of purification, and prepares for the discourses which are to follow.

For parallel of the saying of Jesus in v. 21 see Mk. xiv. 18.

The *reclining in Jesus' bosom* (v 22) means that the disciple was in front of Jesus, as they reclined upon the left side of the body, the head supported by the left hand. Since usually the couch contained three persons, Peter is to be conceived as reclining on another couch, where he could easily see the face of the beloved disciple ; and Judas, since Jesus easily reaches the sop to him, is to be regarded as reclining on the same couch as Jesus ; thus behind him : a dramatic situation ; Jesus in the bosom of Judas but with face averted ; the beloved disciple in the bosom of Jesus, the sunset glow of the Light of the world full upon him ! Since for convenience the feasters reclined with the front of the body forming an acute angle with the edge of the table so as to partially face it, the head of one person would be near the girdle or bosom of his comrade behind, could easily recline against or upon it during the pauses of the meal, v. 25.

On the person of the *beloved disciple* see Introduction, § 7.

*So, when he had dipped the sop*, etc. (vv. 26, 27).—The sop (*ψωμίον*, “ a bit,” “ morsel ”) was some fragment of meat or bread, rendered more palatable by being dipped into some gravy or sauce.

*Judas, the son of Simon Iscariot* : one of the twelve ; mentioned last in the Synoptic lists (Mk. iii. 14-19, and parallels) ; the fourth Gospel alone knows him as the son of

Simon ; Iscariot probably means " a man of Kerioth," a city of Judah ; he was thus the only disciple not a Galilean ; he is previously mentioned in this Gospel, vi. 71 ; xii. 4 ; xiii. 2 ; in vi. 71 and xii. 4 the general disposition of Judas is asserted ; in xiii. 2 the beginning of the special act of betrayal is set forth, as a temptation from Satan ; in xiii. 27 the preparation is completed by the personal entrance of Satan himself into the ethical personality.

*That thou doest, do quickly ;* or perhaps, *more quickly* (*ταχιν*) ; Jesus not only knows the purpose of Judas, he impels him to its execution ; now that his hour is come, let there be no delay. Since there is no mention of a previous bargain of Judas with the Jews (as in Mk. xiv., 10, 11) and Satan enters Judas after the sop, the natural inference is that the evangelist wished to represent the betrayal as planned or arranged with the Jews after this retirement of Judas.

In vv. 29, 30 the ignorance of the disciples is set over against the foreknowledge of Jesus. The *feast* is the Pass-over ; therefore the chronological presentation of v. 1 is here confirmed.

The significance of the traitor's act is in general the same in this Gospel as in the Synoptics, but in the detail there are three notable variations : (a) the character of Judas is foreseen from an earlier time, vi. 70, even the choice of Judas as disciple is apparently made with full knowledge of his nature, and for the purpose of making him an instrument of the divinely ordained death ; (b) while in Mk. (xiv. 18-21) Jesus declares that there is a traitor among his disciples but does not point him out, and in Matt. (xxvi. 21-25) he answers only to Judas's question, and apparently for Judas's ear only, that he is a traitor, in this Gospel Judas is openly designated by a clear word and a formal act ; (c) while in the Synoptics Judas remains until the departure of the group from the room, here he goes out before the meal is over, at any rate before the discourses.

The Johannine presentation makes prominent the foreknowledge and the initiative of Jesus ; even the condemnation of Judas is modified when one remembers the Satan within and the command of Jesus



without ; popular legend released Judas from hell one day in the year. On the traditions concerning his death see Acts i. 20, comment.

The final discourses, xiii. 31-xvii. 26.

Jesus the friend takes leave of his companions ; Jesus the great High-priest completes through his word the purification of his people ; Jesus the eternal and now incarnate Logos, about to return to the Father from whom he came, prepares those whom the Father has given him for the life which awaits them when he, the light of the world, has vanished from vision.

Introduction : the speedy departure announced, and the denial of Peter prophesied, xiii. 31-38.

*Now is the Son of Man glorified*, etc. (vv. 31, 32).—In the commission to Judas the last preparation for the bringing about his death has been made ; the activity is over ; therefore the verse sharply discriminates the two glories : the finished glory of *his activity* which is also the glorification of the Father whom he has declared, i. 18 ; and the glory of his *death, ascension*, and *heavenly activity* which is to come *straightway*.

*A little while* (v. 33) : as also with the Jews, vii. 33 ; which is not here cited : the phrase here formally repeated is viii. 21 ; there a permanent separation, viii. 24 ; here a temporary isolation, v. 36 ; xiv. 3.

*A new commandment* (v. 34).—This is not new in its general form (Lev. xix. 18 ; Matt. v. 43-48 ; xix. 19 ; xxii. 39) nor even in its essential element ; since *καθώς* (*even as*) does not signify degree but rather conformity to example ; the newness consists in the choice of this love as the regulative principle of the new religion in its antithesis to the older Jewish ; and in the peculiar connection, personal and vital, between the disciples' love to Christ and their resultant affection for each other. This divine emotion, the great theme of the first epistle (1 John ii. 10 ; iii. 11, 14, 18 ; iv. 7, 11, 20 ; v. 2), is now made the decisive criterion of true discipleship (v. 35).

*Lord, whither goest thou?* (v. 36).—The foreknowledge and love of Jesus are now shown in sharp contrast to the ignorance or semi-blindness of Peter, who cannot understand the meaning of the phrase *whither I go*, and to his deficient affection for Jesus, since he is to deny discipleship because of his self-love, which however will at length be overcome; since the words: *thou shalt follow afterwards*, probably refer to the future martyrdom (xxi. 18, 19). This significance is presupposed in Peter's question (v. 37).

The answer (v. 38) has its parallels in Mk. xiv. 30; Matt. xxvi. 34; Lk. xxii. 34; the evangelist agrees with Luke in placing the prophecy of the denial at the table; Matt. and Mark present it as uttered after the party are on their way to the Mount of Olives.

First discourse: Equivalents for the physical absence. The hope of future union in heaven, xiv. 1-4; a more complete knowledge of the Son as of the Father, vv. 5-11; new power, vv. 12-14; the presence of the Comforter, vv. 15-17; the spiritual presence of the Son and Father, vv. 18-25; parting blessing, vv. 26-31.

XIV. 1-4 contains a partial answer to Peter's question, xiii. 36, given as a consolation to the disciples. Jesus goes to his Father's house, his death gives him opportunity to prepare there mansions for the disciples; he will return and take them thither; at the Parousia there will become an abiding union.

*Ye believe in God* (xiv. 1).—The marginal rendering is preferable; both verbs are imperative or hortative.

*In my Father's house are many mansions* (v. 2).—The *house* is the upper world, often conceived as consisting of a series of heavens, notably seven, resting one upon another above the fixed and stable earth; the *mansions* (μοναί only here and v. 23 in New Test.) are abiding-places; it was a prevalent Jewish belief that such, each appropriately fitted according to the worth of the fortunate prospective resident, were prepared for the faithful. While sometimes they were probably conceived as descending from heaven to be-

come the abodes of the citizens of the kingdom, here (as in 2 Cor. v. 1) they remain in heaven and Jesus comes to take the disciples to dwell in them; all earthly features are excinded. Though the usual idea of the Parousia as a personal and visible coming may be present in the words: *I will come again* (v. 4), yet since the passage was written after the death of the disciples then present, the probability is that a coming, unseen but efficacious, at the death of each believer, is included in the significance of the phrase: the comings of the ascended Son of Man are in this Gospel many and various, xiv. 18, 21, 28; xvi. 16, 22; the manifestations of xx. 19-xxi. 22 are descents of the ascended Son, see xx. 17, comment.

Despite vv. 1-4 the inapt Thomas does not understand, v. 5.

*I am the way, and the truth, and the life* (v. 6).—The first two self-designations represent the media; the third is medium and goal alike. Jesus is the way, because he by means of his words and self-representation of God communicates here the life which as a death-conquering principle will secure the fulness of eternal life when the believer *cometh* unto the *Father*. The thought is mystical.

The thought of v. 7 is that the knowledge of Christ by the disciples had as yet been imperfect (as by the Jews viii. 19); as this last hour was to bring a perfected conception of the nature of the Son it would also reveal the Father.

*Shew us the Father* (vv. 8, 9).—Philip, despite his early faith (i. 43-46) is still unspiritual; his demand was for a theophany, otherwise Jesus would not have rebuked him. Since Jesus is one with the Father (see x. 30, comment) a knowledge of him is a vision of the Father. The thought of vv. 10, 11 is a repetition of that of x. 38; viii. 28; xii. 49, see comment.

*Greater works than these shall he do* (vv. 12, 13).—The *greater works* are not "signs" but the visibly more extended

and victorious activities in the Gentile world, upon which Jesus could himself not enter during his earthly life. The equipment for this lay in the fact that Jesus had gone to the Father; through his exaltation he has thrown off the limitations of the earthly state and is clothed with the original divine power and dignity, can therefore in answer to prayer in his name (commission) himself accomplish through them his greater works.

*I will pray the Father (v. 16).*—The marginal rendering is better, "make request"; *ἐρωτάω* is used in reference to God only in these farewell discourses; xvi. 26, xvii. 9, 15, 20; it implies here such face-to-face intimacy as is found in ordinary human conversation; it is probable, since there is no request for the Paraclete in the prayer of chap. xvii., that this making request for the sending was to be made after the exaltation.

*He shall give you another Comforter* : the word *παράκλητος* signifies "summoned to one's side"; therefore in defence or assistance, an advocate (1 John ii. 1), assistant; the Greek fathers prefer the meaning "consoler," "comforter." The term is found in the New Test. only in these farewell discourses (xiv. 16, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7;) and 1 John ii. 1. The wider significance of "helper" is preferable, since not only consolation but instruction, reproof, guidance, judgment, are embraced in his activity. The nature of this Paraclete and his relations to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are left in the obscurities of mysticism; the representation oscillates between personality and personification, since on the one side the Paraclete appears: (a) as person distinct from Christ, who is himself here distinctly by implication declared to be a prior Paraclete as distinguished from "another" who shall come, (b) as advocate (1 John ii. 1); (c) as convicter of the unbelieving world (xvi. 7-10): on the other the Paraclete: (a) is *given* rather than *sent* (xiv 16, but sent in v. 26); (b) is the *Spirit of truth* (xiv. 17, see

comment); (c) appears identified with Christ, who will return to abide with believers (xiv. 23), and it is unlikely that the evangelist intends the doctrine that the disciples after Christ's departure should have two Paracletes since the "other" appears as substitute. He (it) proceedeth from the Father (xv. 26), is sent by the Son (xvi. 7). The term Paraclete is also used by Philo with the same significance of God's "helper"; and is connected (*Vita Mos.*, iii. 14) with the intercessory function of the high-priest; and Philo's "Logos" is also assistant and mediator.

*The Spirit of truth* (v. 17).—The Paraclete here is sublimated into a spirit, of truth, as opposed to the *spirit of error*, 1 John iv. 6. A literal translation of the remainder of the verse runs: *which the world is not able to receive, for it beholdeth it not, neither knoweth it; ye know it, for it abideth in you and shall be in you.*

In vv. 18-24 the teaching concerning the Paraclete is apparently interrupted by the thought of the future presence of Christ with the believers, and is resumed again in v. 26. But the whole contents of the passage: a beholding hidden from the world, v. 19; a manifestation to *every one* (not to the twelve only) that hath and keepeth Jesus' commandments (vv. 22, 23); a coming and abiding which is also a coming and abiding of the Father (v. 23);—all these show that it is not the transient and limited post-resurrection appearances of chapter xx. (Holtzmann, Weiss) nor the Parousia, which are in question, but the spiritual presence of Christ with believers, which is in essence and sequence the same as the presence of the Paraclete.

*I come unto you* (v. 18): see preceding paragraph. It is possible that the appearances of chap. xx are not excluded.

*The world seeth me no more, but ye see me* (v. 19).—The point lies in the double meaning of the verb (*θεωρέω*); the sensuous seeing of the world is contrasted with the spiritual

vision of believers; the present tense indicates the habitual and constant.

*In that day* (v. 20) is neither specifically nor exclusively Pentecost nor the Parousia, but the whole era following the glorification; faith will become gnosis, the ripened Christian experience: Christ in the Father, all believers in him and therefore in the Father.

*He that hath my commandments*, etc. (v. 21).—This “being in Christ” is now set forth more specifically: it is the love that hath the commandments of Christ and keepeth them; this love will secure the (special, iii. 16) love of God, and new inward manifestations of the glorified Christ.

Judas now, following Thomas (v. 5) and Philip (v. 8), shows how far the Master’s spiritual teaching transcends his powers of comprehension; he thinks of visible phenomena (v. 22). The answer of Jesus (vv. 23, 24) is a repetition of v. 21, of vii. 16. *The word which ye hear* is the sum of the public teaching of Christ as well as this private instruction.

Verses 25-31 are apparently the close of the discourse. Jesus promises the Paraclete to aid the disciples in remembering his words and to complete the process of instruction, gives them the solemn blessing of his peace, bids them remember his prophetic utterances, declares the time for instruction over, calls upon them to arise and go.

On the *Comforter* (v. 26) see v. 16, comment.

*Peace I leave with you* (v. 27).—This is the parting salutation, the Hebrew “shalom lak”; the peace is not simply repose of mind or outward quiet, but good fortune, prosperity, well-being; the best one can wish for one’s friends, therefore its significance depends upon the person wishing; given by Jesus it is not given as the world giveth; it is spiritual well-being, felicity; it includes absence of anxiety and fear.

Verse 28 contains reference to vv; 1-3, 18.

*If ye loved me*: the fullness of love is absent; this would

have forgotten the personal loss of absence in joy over the gain which would come to the Son in his return to the Father. This gain is founded in the fact that "*the Father is greater than I*" This greater and permanent glory of the Father will lend new glory to the exalted Son.

The passage is of importance in determining the Christology of the Gospel. Many interpreters suppose that the word "now" is to be inserted: the Father is greater than the Son in his incarnate state of being, but will not be when the Son has been exalted. This is the explanation of those who hold the doctrine of the Kenosis. But there is no reason why such a conception should be imported here; the sentence expresses a permanent relation; the Christology is, like the Ante-Nicene in general, of the subordinationist type. On the other hand the expression would be meaningless on the assumption of the pure humanity of Christ. The Logos doctrine of the prologue is here; Christ is *θεός*; i. e., of a divine order of being; i. 1.

*Ye may believe* (v. 29).—The clause is to be completed by the addition of some such phrase as: "that I go to the Father."

*The prince of the world cometh*, etc. (vv. 30, 31).—He is Satan, whose agent is death. *He hath nothing in me*; he hath no power over me: the yielding of Jesus to death is not compulsory but a free act (x. 18); whose ground is that the Father, whom he loves, and therefore will obey, has given him commandment so to do: therefore no delay but instant obedience. *Arise, let us go hence*.

Second discourse.—The future relation of the disciples to the Son and the Father, xv. 1-11, to each other, vv. 12-17, to the world, xv. 18-xvi. 4; the sending the Comforter at the Son's departure to convict the world and illuminate the believers, vv. 5-15; the departure of the Son as a momentary sorrow for the disciples to be followed by the joy of his spiritual return and presence and the gifts of the Father in answer to prayer in the Son's name, vv. 16-28; the near departure is a token of victory, not defeat, vv. 29-33.

The allegory of the Vine, xv. 1-11. Jesus is the source of the believer's spiritual vitality, as is the vine-stock to the branches.

The allegory was familiar to readers of the Old Test.; see Ps. lxxx. 9-16; Is. v. 17; Ezek. xv 1-6; xix. 10-14; Ecclus. xxiv. 17; we have here a specimen distinctly Christian; the persons addressed are the whole body of future believers; especially the Church of the author's time. The fruitless branches (*v. 2*) are the word-Christians of Matt. vii. 21-23; the cleansing of the fruitful ones is a pruning process; the faults are cut away. This has already been accomplished for the twelve by the word of Jesus (*v. 3*).

*Abide* (*v. 4*).—The verb μένω, in the mystical usage of the Johannine writings, is often of pregnant meaning; it denotes both faith and permanence, the fixed establishment of the believer in the word and spirit of Christ, union of soul; perhaps also here especially the remaining in the Church despite the centrifugal forces of Gnostic thought, loyalty to the Son. The use of the imperative indicates the limitation of the determinism; the branches of the grape-vine grow from the stalk by necessity of nature and cannot of their own initiative sever themselves; but believers can sunder themselves from Christ, therefore the need of the exhortation: on the determinism see vi. 44, comment. The words *will abide* are to be added to the clause: *And I in you*; here the simple idea of permanence is prominent; the Pauline idea of the believer's life from Christ the Spirit (Gal. v. 6, Rom. viii. 10) is here intensified and presented mystically.

In *v. 6* the result of not abiding is presented in figure and phrase resembling Matt. iii. 10, 12; v. 13; vii. 19; xiii. 30, 42; xviii. 8, 9. The two verbs: ἐβλήθη and ἐξηράνθη, as Aorists, are to be rendered *was* (already) *cast*, *was withered*: the standpoint is the time of the Messianic judgment; at that time the fruitless branches will have already, by command of the husbandman, been cast out of the vineyard and are withered so as to burn well, and are by the servants gathered and burned; the total result of false discipleship is an immediate pre-Messianic spiritual decadence and at the



Parousia its judgment: here the forward look of the New Testament usually ceases, since its eschatology is practical rather than speculative.

*Ask whatsoever ye will* (vv. 7, 8).—The contents of the petitions are determined by the preceding clause; they who abide in Christ can ask only for the spiritually wholesome, which being granted becomes the fruit (v. 8) that glorifies the Father and as activity becomes a realisation of true discipleship.

In vv. 9, 10, the relations of the Father and Son are set forth as an ideal for the relations of believers and the Son. Christ's love of his own is perfect, as the Father's is to him; the true goal of the disciples is the loving obedience which the Son, as subordinate, has rendered to the Father.

*That my joy may be in you* (v. 11).—The joy was the calm exultation which was the result of loving obedience, sacrifice, courage, and faith triumphant in the face of death. This joy of Jesus will fulfil, complete, the disciples' joy; this is the common gift to believers, a gladness of spirit independent of external condition; see 2 Cor. i., 24, xiii. 11; Phil. ii. 17, 18; 1 John i. 4.

Verse 12 is a repetition of xiii. 34, see comment.

*Greater love hath no man than this* (v. 13).—Both the depth and the narrowness of the evangelist's interpretation of Jesus find here a most striking exemplification. This deep and limpid but narrow stream of affection is in striking contrast to the broad river of universal love in the Sermon on the Mount; see Matt. v. 43-48, and Rom. v. 6-10. Westcott's assertion that the *friends* are here *all men*, is contradicted by v. 14, as by the whole tone of the Gospel.

*Ye are my friends*, etc. (v. 14).—Such is the superiority of Jesus that obedience becomes the test of friendship.

*No longer do I call you servants* (v. 15).—The reference is apparently to xiii. 16: intimacy and complete interchange of thought and feeling are the characteristics of friendship;

these the slave cannot enjoy. The Christ is so rich and the disciple-friends so poor that the communications must be from him; they have nothing worthy to contribute. *All things* is, because of xvi. 12, a hyperbole.

*Ye have not chosen me*, etc. (v. 16).—A second feature of the friendship is that Christ, the superior, has sought it; its end is not selfish delight but spiritual fruitfulness, which the Father will bestow as answer to prayer *in the name*, i. e., in the interests or under the authority, of Jesus.

The relation of the disciples to the world, xv. 18-xvi. 4.

*If the world hateth you* (v. 18).—The *world* is here the ungodly, hostile multitude, as it confronted the Christians of the first and second centuries; especially the hostile Jews (xvi. 2); the persecutors, both Jew and Gentile. The reason of the hatred is set forth in v. 19; the disciples are *not of the world*.

The quotation of v. 20 is from xiii. 16; the experience of the master foretells that of the servant. The ground of this hostile treatment lies in the absence of the knowledge of God, v. 21, but for this ignorance they are not blameless.

*They had not had sin* (v. 22).—The *sin* is, as usually in this Gospel, that of unbelief, which is rendered inexcusable both by the words and by the self-revelation of Jesus, since they manifest the Father also; therefore hatred of the manifesting Son is hatred of the manifested Father (v. 23); the same sin is incurred by refusal to accept the *works* of Jesus (v. 24).

This hatred is now (v. 25) from the point of view of the Johannine determinism (on which see vi. 44, comment) set forth in its ultimate ground; it is the fulfilment of the divine will as revealed in prophetic Scripture. The passage cited is either Ps. xxxv. 19 or lxix. 4; both are from the time of Nehemiah (Cheyne, *Bampton Lectures*, 232) and the enemies are the opponents of the reform move-

ment; only by grammatical violence is the incomplete sentence forced into service; the word *law* is a general designation of the Old Test., as x. 34.

This testimony, borne by Jesus, by his words, by his works (22-25), is now after his departure to be continued by the Comforter and by the disciples (vv. 26, 27).

On the Comforter, see xiv. 16, comment. This testimony will all be visibly borne by the disciples; its sources are two: the Paraclete and the spirit of the disciples.

*They shall put you out of the synagogues (xvi. 2):* see ix. 22, 34; xii. 42; in Mk. xiii. 9, Matt. x. 17, the disciples are to be scourged in the synagogues: the outlook here is upon a hostility and fanaticism which regard the killing of the disciples an act of religious service; "every one that sheds the blood of the wicked is as he that offereth an offering", Midrash on Numb. xxv. 13; the hatreds of following decades appear here as prophecy. These persecutions have their ground in ignorance of the Father and the Son (v. 3).

**In vv. 5-15 the Comforter is promised; he will convict the world and illuminate the disciples.**

*I go unto him that sent me (v. 5):* see xiv. 1-4; xiii. 36: whence many suppose that xiii. 36-xiv. 31 once followed this chapter; see note following xvii. 26.

*It is expedient for you that I go away (v. 7):* because the Comforter (see xiv. 16, comment) whom Jesus will send, as xv. 26 (but the Father sends, xiv. 26), is for their instruction more efficient, since he abides for ever (xiv. 16), than Jesus, who is with his chosen only for a little while.

*When he is come, he will convict the world (v. 8).—*The Paraclete, as Advocate for believers, will confute the *world*. The verb ἐλέγχω, "*convict*," includes the ideas of bringing one's error into clear consciousness and of inducing a sense of shame; the Spirit reproves as well as convinces. Since this spirit, Paraclete, dwells in and effectuates the disciples,

it is through their activities that this conviction of the world will be accomplished; but the figure is that of a judicial investigation, at which the Paraclete, as attorney, secures the conviction of the world in its legal issue with the Church, and thus secures a true decision concerning sin, righteousness, judgment.

*Of sin, because they believe not on me (v. 9).*—The *sin* is, as xv. 22, especially the crime of non-belief on Jesus despite the testimony of his person, his words, his works, xv. 22-24. The Calvinistic position that the word *sin* is here used in its most general sense, is to be rejected, since the following counts of conviction are clearly specific.

*Of righteousness, because I go to my Father (v. 10).*—The world accused and executed Jesus as a sinner, ix. 24; xviii. 30; the fact that he has risen and gone to the Father proves that he is, *par excellence*, the righteous one, 1 John ii. 1; iii. 7; therefore the world is convicted of unrighteousness.

*Of judgment, because the prince of this world hath been judged (v. 11).*—The death of Jesus appeared to be a victory for Satan; it has proven to be his defeat, his condemnation; and therefore also the judgment of the world, his subjects. See xiii. 2, 27; xii. 31, comment.

Since this conviction of the world comes through the agency of the disciples as organs of the Paraclete, their testimony becomes of the utmost importance, especially as it was the means by which the resurrection and ascension were established, and thus the error of the world confuted. Therefore also comes the ever-increasing apologetic value of the evidence for the resurrection, and the growth of the tradition.

Now follows the delineation of the office of the Paraclete for the disciples; he is to be their teacher (vv. 12-15). The many things which Jesus has now no opportunity to impart, he, the abiding spirit of truth, will communicate, both things present and things to come. Since the spirit is

subordinate to both Son and Father, xiv 16, 26; xv. 26, he repeats only what he hears; his activity therefore results in the greater glory of the Son.

In this passage the Catholic Church finds the basis for its dogma of the equal authority of Scripture and tradition; but in reality Scripture is the earliest and most valuable tradition; even if the "message of the spirit" is, in itself, "absolute divine truth" (Westcott), it becomes relative in passing through the personality of the disciples and the limitations of human speech and individual comprehension; the search for dogmatic inerrancy is idle and fruitless.

In vv. 16-28 is set forth the teaching of the spiritual return and presence of Christ with his disciples. The passage has as parallel xiv. 18-25.

*A little while* (v. 16).—This word, *μικρόν*, like the *μαρναθά*, "the Lord cometh," of 1 Cor. xvi. 22, must have been one of the watchwords of the early Church, bursting hot from the lips of disciples waiting amid toil and obloquy and persecution for the relief and triumph and splendour of the Parousia. With the decades following the first eager anticipation came the extension of the Christian movement among Gentiles who were strangers to the Jewish eschatology, the sense of delay or delusion, the cooling of the old enthusiasm, the death of the first generation who were the most assured watchers for the returning Master (2 Peter iii. 4), the wearying strain of effort that only increased opposition, and now the red blood of martyrdom which cried in vain for retribution, Rev. vi. 10. What could "a little while" mean? The new age and changed conditions demanded a new interpretation, and lofty Christian faith here furnishes it. The "little while" which Jesus had in mind was not the indefinite period, now grown to be decades long, between the separation at Gethsemane and the visible Parousia; it was only the brief space between the farewell and the spiritual return at Pentecost or even on the Easter morning, since which he had never been absent.

Instead of *Because* in v. 17 read *that*; the ὅτι is simply recitative and introduces the citation of v. 10.

*Ye shall weep and lament* (v. 20).—At the death of Jesus the unbelieving world will exult.

In v. 21 this sorrow of the disciples is compared to the birth-pangs of a pregnant woman: the figure is frequent in the Old Test.; Is. xxi. 3; xxvi. 17, 18; lxvi. 7-9; Mic. iv. 9-10. The Synoptic tradition of the Parousia discourse knows also of travail pains, Mk. xiii. 9; Matt. xxiv. 8; in the Synoptics these are future and include the whole cycle of woes and sorrows which fall upon the world before Messiah appears from heaven; in this Gospel they are the sharp but brief sorrow of the disciples which lies between Gethsemane and Easter morning or Pentecost.

*I will see you again* (v. 22).—The clause refers both to the appearances of chapter xx, and (especially) to the permanent spiritual presence when the Son and Father come to abide in the Church, xiv. 23; the *joy* is not the transient emotion of Easter, but the continued joy of the age, which no one taketh away; Rom. xiv. 7; Gal. v. 22; 1 Peter i. 8; 1 John i. 4.

*In that day* (v. 23): see xiv. 20, comment. The word "me" is emphatic; the disciples are to turn to *God*; he will through his Spirit answer prayer in the name of Jesus.

*Hitherto* (v. 24).—Since Jesus was with them, and the Spirit not yet given (vii. 39), the disciples had made no requests of God in the name of Jesus; therefore to the imperative "*ask*" is to be added, as demanded by the connection, the words: *in the name of Jesus*. See, as parallels, xiv. 13, 14; xv. 11; Matt. vii. 7.

*These things* (v. 25).—The phrase refers to the last discourses especially, but also to the whole teaching of Jesus; because of the deficient comprehension of the disciples all the instruction had been given in *proverbs*, by which word (παροιμία) is denoted a dark, symbolic, or figurative mode

of utterance; the *time that cometh* is the time of the spiritual presence of Jesus as the Spirit of truth, when he thus as the *inward* word will speak plainly

On verse 26 see v. 23. Verse 27 gives the reason why it will not be necessary for Jesus to pray for the disciples; the Father loves them. See xiv. 21.

*I came forth from the Father* (v. 28).—The verse is an assertion of pre-existent dwelling with God and return to him; a repetition of the thought in xiii. 3; see comment on iii. 2 and xiii. 3.

*Thou knowest all things* (v. 30).—This sweeping assertion of omniscience is in the following clause shown to be hyperbole; it is the hearts of men which Jesus knows so completely that he *needs not that any man should ask him* questions; he foresees and thus answers in full the unseen questionings of his disciples: this is proof that he has *come from God*, see xiii. 3, comment. The verse is thus a final pre-crucifixion confession of faith, as xx. 28 is a post-crucifixion one.

This belief may be real but is defective; therefore the announcement of the coming defection (v. 32); the saying has its parallel in the Synoptic account of the last meal and the walk to Gethsemane; see Mk. xiv. 27, 50; Matt. xxv. 31.

*These things* (v. 33): reference to the whole discourse from xv. 1. A double antithesis is strongly set forth: *peace* (on which see xiv. 27, comment) versus *tribulation*; *Christ* versus the *world*; but the ground of good cheer for the disciples in this final parting is that Jesus leaves them in a defeated world, whose evil principle he has overcome.

The high-priestly prayer of Jesus, xvii. 1-26.

Jesus, the true high-priest, about to enter the holy place, heaven, to procure salvation for his chosen by the sacrifice of himself, pauses at the entrance to utter a prayer of intercession. He prays (a) for himself, for his own glorification by death since his work of manifesting the Father is over, vv. 1-8; (b) for his present disciples that

they may be preserved from the evil world and sanctified for their work, vv. 9-19; (c) for the future disciples, the Church, that they be preserved in unity and brought toward perfection, until all his own shall be with him where he is, vv. 20-26.

*These things spake Jesus (xvii. 1).*—The reference is to the whole body of sayings in chap. xiii.-xvi. Since there is no sign of change of place, the prayer is to be regarded as uttered where the preceding discourse is conceived as ending, whether xiv. 31 or xvi. 33. The position of many (Westcott *et al.*), that it was uttered in the courts of the temple, is based simply on the fact that in xv. 1 ff. there is given the allegory of the vine, and that golden vines formed a part of the ornamentation of the entrance to the inner temple; a flimsy foundation.

*The hour is come*; see xii. 27; xiii. 1, comment.

*Glorify thy Son*: i.e., by the means of his death and exaltation (see xiii. 31, 32, comment), which is the cause of added glory for the Father (see xii. 28, comment).

*As thou gavest him authority over all flesh (v. 2).*—See xiii. 3; Matt. xxviii. 18. *All flesh* signifies the whole human race; of these the Father had given him a part; only on this pre-condition of being drawn or given by the Father could men respond to the word of Christ: on this determinism see vi. 44, comment. On *eternal life* see i. 4, comment. This life eternal is now (v. 3) set forth as specially *illumination, gnosis*; the *only God* is to be known instead of the many deities of heathenism; the *true* God instead of the false, and *Jesus Christ* (the word Christ is a personal name here, as 1 John iii. 23; iv. 2, 3; 1 Tim. vi. 13; 2 Tim. ii. 8) as the pre-existent and heavenly Sent of God. The passage is a Johannine confession of faith after the manner of 1 Tim. iii. 16 in Pauline circles.

Verses 4 and 5 are correlative: to the words "I," "glorified," "thee," "on the earth," of v. 4 correspond respectively: "thou," "glorify," "me," "with thine own



self" (*παρὰ σεαυτῶ*) of v. 5: Jesus having conferred a glory (*δόξα*) on the Father by finishing on earth the allotted task, now requests in return a glory in heaven, and indeed one which he had with the Father before the world was.

That this glory was a prospective glory reserved in heaven "before the world was" for the future Messiah, existing also only in the idea and purpose of God, is indeed a possible interpretation (thus the Socinians, Beyschlag, Wendt); but a personal pre-existence in a state of glory like that of God is more probably here affirmed, because (a) the glory is said to be not one which "thou hadst (reserved) for me," but one "which I had with thee"; (b) the phrase "before the world was" indicates something which antedates creation; (c) the phrases "with thine own self" (*παρὰ σεαυτῶ*), and "with thee" (*παρὰ σοί*), are apparently identical; (d) the implication of pre-existence is conformable to the general teaching of the Gospel: see viii. 58; the Logos recalls his former heavenly existence.

*I have manifested thy name* (v. 6).—The manifestation of the name is here the revelation of God as the Father; this is vouchsafed to those given by the Father to the Son from the hostile world, as v. 2. This revelation in the word and works of the Son (vv. 7, 8) has brought the disciples to the belief in the divine origin and sending of the Son; see xvi. 28, 30, comment.

The prayer for the present disciples, vv. 9-19.

*I pray for them* (v. 9).—The emphasis lies upon the subject; the personality of the petitioner, his relation to the Father constitutes the sufficient ground for a full answer to the prayer.

The phrases *for them* and *for the world* are in complete antithesis. Jesus cannot make request for those whom the Father has not given him; according to the whole concept of the evangelist Jesus loves his own as Satan loves his own, the unbelieving world, which is the sense of the word *κόσμος* in this passage.

*I am glorified in them* (v. 10); literally: *I have been glori-*

*fied in them*; the faith of his followers was the glory of the Master.

*I am no longer in the world (v. 11).*—The expression is anticipative, like xii. 31; xiii. 31. The *name which thou hast given me* is the name which in v. 6 Jesus had *manifested*; the name signifies God the Father as revealed by Christ; therefore it is here said to be given to Christ that he may give (manifest) it to the disciples.

The adjective *Holy* is chosen to make more complete the antithesis of God and the undivine *world* in which the disciples are left. The Son and the Father *are one*, in ethical unity, especially in power, see x. 30, comment: the prayer is for the same union among the disciples.

*Not one of them perished but the son of perdition (v. 12).*—The clause is anticipative, as v. 11; the reference is to Judas, see xiii. 26, comment; since xiii. 27 he is regarded as entirely lost from the group of disciples. The word *son* denotes here one "worthy of" or "destined to" (*destruction*); so *sons of the kingdom*, Matt. viii. 12; "of Gehenna," Matt. xxiii. 15; *destruction* is the antithesis of life (*Ζωή*); see 2 Thess. ii. 3.

On the *ioy* of v. 13, see xvi. 22, comment.

*I have given unto them thy word (v. 14):* a repetition of v. 8; the whole teaching expressed in the collective term, *word*.

*The world hated them*; the experiences of the early Christians are stated anticipatively; the reason of the hatred lies in the fact that, ethically, the disciples are, like Jesus, outside the sphere of the ungodly forces of the time.

*From the evil one (v. 15)* is the preferable translation, since the preposition *ἐκ* denotes here, as 1 John iii. 12, "out of the domain of." In 1 John v. 18, Satan is the wicked one, *ὁ πονηρός*.

Verse 16 is a repetition of v. 14, serving as motive for the request of the following verse.

*Sanctify them in the truth (v. 17):* *i. e.*, consecrate them for their calling in the world. Whether the word *in* (*ἐν*)

denotes the means ("through") or the sphere ("in the domain of") is unimportant; the *truth* is here not alone correct apprehension but, as often, a corresponding mode of life: so to live as to *do the truth*, iii. 21, viii. 44. *Thy word is truth*: the revelation through the teaching and person of Jesus is the word, as v. 14 above.

Verse 18 sets forth the need of the prayer of v. 17. As the Son was consecrated when the Father sent him into the world, so should his disciples, sent by him, be capacitated for their task. The past tense "I sent" is anticipative of xx. 21; but the whole contents of chap. xiv.-xvi. may be regarded as a commission.

*And for their sakes I sanctify myself (v. 19).*—To the consecration from God at the Son's coming into the world is now added his self-consecration in departing from it through death on the cross. This self-consecration and sacrifice is for the sake of the disciples, since his departure will be for their advantage; see xiv. 26; xvi. 7, comment. The death of Christ is here represented as a free act originating in his holy love for his disciples, the purpose of which is their complete sanctification, their equipment for their task. There is no idea of substitutional atonement; the Son, who is here both high-priest and sacrifice, offers himself in furtherance of the work of salvation which his incarnation has begun.

The prayer for the Church of the future, vv. 20-26.

The fundamental request is for its unity; of which the unity of the Father with the Son is the type.

*That they may be in us (v. 21).*—Though the word "one" is omitted from the text, it is to be supplied in the sense; from the unity of the Church is to come the demonstration that the Father has sent the Son, xiii. 35. On the oneness of Father and Son see x. 30, comment.

*The glory (v. 22)* is the same as that of v. 10; the Pauline

glory (2 Cor. iii. 7-18) of the new covenant has here become actualised proleptically, and is manifested in the unity of the Church (v. 23), perfected by the indwelling of the Son, in whom the Father dwells; both the divine mission of the Son and the love of the Father to the Church are thereby demonstrated.

The last request of the Son is that his whole Church may be with him after the Parousia (v. 24).

*That which thou hast given me* includes the whole category of believers, present (vv. 9-19) and future (vv. 20-23). *Where I am : i. e.*, in the Father's house, as xiv. 2, 3. The *glory* is here not the glory which the Christ displayed *while on earth* (i. 14), but the glory of the pre-existent condition, which was given by the Father, as a token of his love, *before the foundation of the world* through the Logos-Christ (i. 3). At this consummation, therefore, the disciples *will see him as he*, in his true nature, *is*, 1 John iii. 2. See xvii. 5, comment.

The conclusion (vv. 25-26) contains the justification for the prayer: it is the antithesis, the hostility, between the disciples and the world in which Jesus is to leave them; he who knew the Father has given the believers his knowledge in part during his life, xvi. 12, and *will make* the revelation *all known* in his departure through the ministry of the Comforter, the spirit of truth, xiv. 16, 6; that both the Christ and the Father's love may dwell in them.

While in the earliest sources (Mk. xiv. 26-32; Matt. xxvi. 30-36) only a brief announcement of the coming events and of Peter's denial lies between the last meal and Gethsemane, and thus the foreboding Jesus goes silently to meet his fate, already in Luke. (xxii. 24-30) we find a brief discourse preceding the departure of the company, in which Jesus appoints for his disciples a kingdom like that appointed for him by his Father.

In the fourth Gospel this final discourse—including the prayer of chap. xvii.—has become the most extended section, the most characteristic feature, of the composition; into it is poured the whole wealth

of the Johannine conception of the Logos-Christ, and in it the eschatology of the Synoptics appears transformed and sublimated. The future disturbances in the synagogues, the presence and assistance of the Holy Spirit, the tribulation in the world, the coming of the Son of Man, appear in both representations of the future (compare Matt. x. 17, 18 with John xvi. 1-3; Matt. x. 19, 20 with John xiv. 23-26; Mk. xiii. 9-13 with John xvi. 33). The discourses on the Parousia, delivered near the temple, form an important element in the Synoptic presentation of the events which preceded by two days the evening of the Passover meal. These are in form omitted by the fourth evangelist, but their theme: the future of the Church and the Parousia, appears in these chapters, xiv.-xvi., in a most refined and spiritual expression. The Parousia is more truly a presence than a coming; it is Christ the Spirit abiding in the souls of his chosen. The chiliastic expectations of Jewish Christianity are set aside, and the ideal future of the new age is a purified community of believers, in whom the Son and Father dwell, whose spirit leads them into all truth and among whom love is the law of life.

The dependence upon Synoptic sources, the peculiar Johannine phraseology and Christology, the length of the discourses, the impossibility of a literally exact reproduction, the explanation of such features as the long delay of a personal and visible Parousia (see xvi. 16, comment), the presence of Pauline conceptions, the transfer of apostolic experiences into the earlier period of Jesus' ministry—are sufficient proof, if proof were needed, of the free and ideal character of the composition; but the ideals are of such sublime spiritual character that the chapters are truly, as Luther well said, "the pearls of the Gospel."

One may not pronounce with certainty any opinion as to the unity of the discourses. In many respects chapters xv.-xvi. appear to be a duplicate of chapter xiv.; but repetition is a characteristic of Johannine discourse. There appear to be two formal partings, two final salutations, xiv. 27-31; xvi. 31-33. Because of the relation of xvi. 5 to xiii. 36, xiv. 1-6, many critics maintain that xv. 1-xvi. 33 are to be inserted either after xiii. 20 or 30 or 35; thus xiv. 27-31 would become the only and true parting word.

As in the Synoptic record a prayer or series of prayers lies between the last meal and the arrest (Mk. xiv. 32-42) so in the fourth Gospel. There it is uttered in Gethsemane, alone, in anguish, its theme the personal outlook, its petition a heart-stirring cry for deliverance from death, dying away into submission; here it is spoken in the

supper-room, amid the disciples, in peace and composure since the struggle is over (see xii. 27, comment), its theme the completion of the work of salvation in the future Church, its petition for a death which shall be for the Son glorification and for his own the onward step into truth and perfection. As in the Synoptics Jesus prayed three times, here there are three prayers; for self, for present disciples, for the later Church.

It is clearly the evangelist's substitute for the Gethsemane scene; the passage from the supper-room into the hands of the officers is without a tremor. Thus the omission of the agony in Gethsemane is explained. When it is said that "it did not lie in the plan" of the evangelist to insert it (Meyer, Luthardt, *et multi*), therein is the concession that the presentation was determined by dogmatic considerations: the Gethsemane scene is incongruous with the Johannine Christ. Candour may indeed hesitate to pronounce both prayers psychologically impossible to the same lips in the same midnight hour, but it must find here an improbability of the highest degree. The petition of chapter xvii. is unusually rich in the peculiar phrases and ideas of the evangelist and the author of 1 John (see vv. 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, 21, 24, comment): and while in form a prayer, it is in substance a third discourse of the evening, in which the absence of any regard for the world is as characteristic as is the depth and richness of the love for God, his Son and his Church.

### Part III. Jesus the heavenly king, xviii. 1-xxi.25.

Already presented as prophet (chap. i. 19-xii.), as priest (chap. xiii-xvii.), Jesus is now set forth as the true heavenly king. As such he is to meet the hostility of earthly rulers: he is arrested and taken before Annas, Caiaphas, Pilate, xviii. 1-32; he declares himself king of a spiritual kingdom, vv. 33-40; is condemned and crucified as a false king xix. 1-42; as king over death raises himself from the dead, ascends to his Father, returns as spiritual sovereign to give his vice-gerents their commission (xx. 19-23) and be accepted as heavenly lord and God, xx. 1-31. At the lake of Galilee he feeds his disciples; restores Peter, and commissions him; contrasts the future of Peter and "the beloved disciple," xxi. 1-25.

### The arrest, xviii. 1-11.

Jesus goes freely to his familiar place of resort, and with many opportunities to escape, is at his own initiative taken prisoner. Judas, the Roman cohort, the Jewish officers fall before him, but he

gives himself into their hands, refusing defence, but asking freedom for his disciples.

*He went forth* (xviii. 1).—The verb ἐξῆλθε is better translated “he went out”: the evangelist represents “these words” (chap. xiii. 30, xvii. 26) as spoken in the city, probably in the supper-room. The passage over the Kidron (a winter brook flowing between the temple mount and Olivet) is of special interest because King David also passed over it “a fugitive to return in triumph”; see 2 Sam. xv. 23. The name means “dark”; it designated the valley as well as the stream; into this gloomy valley Jesus went from the light of the supper-room. The Synoptics apparently regard the garden as upon the slopes or summit of Olivet.

The mention of the familiarity of the place (v. 2) is for the purpose of describing the arrest as voluntary on the part of Jesus; he was no cowardly fugitive, as probably the hostile Jews of the evangelist’s time asserted.

*The band* (v. 3) or *cohort* is here the familiar garrison of the citadel of Antonia; the *band* (σπεῖρα) usually numbered 500 or 600 men; there is no indication that a part only was present.

On the pre-knowledge of Jesus (v. 4) see xiii. 1, comment. *Jesus went forth*, i. e., out of the garden; there is no attempt to hide. *Judas* (v. 5) here only silently points out the person to be arrested; in the Synoptics he greets Jesus and kisses him as a sign to the officers, but here the evangelist makes Jesus take the initiative and identify himself before Judas speaks; there is free surrender instead of concealment; nor can Judas, as given over to destruction, xvii. 12, and symbolic of Antichrist, defile the holy king by an unclean kiss; he remains silent.

*They went backward, and fell to the ground* (v. 6).—Among these Judas is included; the vision of this king of men prostrates them, vii. 44-46. This supernatural feature only brings into more clear relief the voluntary surrender;

Jesus might have escaped when all were prostrate; but he repeats the question, entreats freedom from arrest for his followers (*v.* 8), as fulfilment of xvii. 12; see x. 11, 12.

In *vv.* 10, 11 is inserted the feature of the attempt of one disciple to defend Jesus by force (Mk. xiv. 47; Matt. xxvi. 51-53; Lk. xxii. 50, 51). The identification of this hitherto unnamed disciple with Peter brings that disciple into the foreground in a way characteristic of the Gospel: he is prominent but erratic and really inferior, he is rebuked by Jesus.

The representation follows on the whole the Synoptic sources, Mk. xiv. 43-52; Matt. xxvi. 47-56; Lk. xxii. 47-53. The omitted features are either such as were unimportant for the author's purposes, or incompatible with his presentation of Jesus: on the omission of the agony in Gethsemane see close of remarks following xvii. 26. The features added are largely for the purpose of emphasising the idea that the arrest of Jesus was the result of his own plan (xiii. 27) and free initiative: he might have escaped: the victory of his foes is only apparent; his is the true triumph.

**Jesus before the Jewish tribunals, xviii. 12-27.**

Jesus the true heavenly king is summoned before the Jewish rulers, Annas and Caiaphas; he affirms the open and public manner of his teaching and activity; and defies contradiction. Peter denies that he is a disciple of Jesus.

*Annas* (*v.* 13) was himself high-priest from 6 to 15 A. D., and four sons followed him in that office; he is mentioned in Lk. iii. 2 and Acts iv. 6, but does not appear in the Synoptic narrative of the trial of Jesus. On Caiaphas see xi. 49, 50, comment.

On the problem included in the expression "another disciple" see Introduction § 7. The ready entrance of this disciple into the palace is contrasted with the case of Peter, who cannot enter without assistance, and whose denial of discipleship also had much significance for the author: see Introduction, § 7.



*The high priest therefore asked Jesus of his disciples and his teaching (v. 19).*—This “preliminary hearing” is before the person of the highest rank in the Jewish government. He who had prophesied that his disciples were to be summoned “before governors and kings” could be placed before no lower tribunal than this; the trial before the Sanhedrin is unmentioned, and there is no reason to suppose that the evangelist intended to represent it as included in the statement of v. 24.

The reply of Jesus (vv. 20, 21) is bold and haughty, the answer of ruler to ruler, the greater king to the less.

The phrases : *I ever taught in synagogues and in temple in secret spake I nothing*, must be regarded as hyperbole; the general character of the teaching is asserted; there was no secret conspiracy : ask the Jews, your unprejudiced fellow-countrymen. The tone is of irony and defiance. This is so offensive to an officer that a blow on the face follows (v. 22), with a rebuke (see Acts xxiii. 2); the reply of Jesus is no excuse but a challenge to furnish evidence. The evangelist inserts this incident to show that before a legal tribunal the public and politically harmless nature of Christ’s teaching (and therefore of Christian teaching in general) was triumphantly established; this is no secret organisation; “this thing was not done in a corner,” Acts xxvi. 26; neither Annas nor the officer can furnish proof of the contrary. See Mk. xiv 48, 49.

*Annas therefore sent him bound unto Caiaphas (v. 24).*—The emphasis lies upon the words *therefore* and *bound*. Since Annas can neither reply to, nor by testimony refute, Jesus, he sends him maliciously to Caiaphas; he is in effect defeated, and Jesus triumphant; that he sends Jesus bound is an indication to Caiaphas that he is hostile. The harmonists affirm that the condemnation of Jesus by the Sanhedrin (Mk. xiv. 55-65; Matt. xxvi. 59-68; Lk. xxii. 63-71) is to be regarded as implicitly contained in this verse; on this

question, as also on the difficulty which it introduces and the proposed solutions, see the remarks following v. 27.

*Simon Peter was standing and warming himself (v. 25).*—There is here no intimation of a change of place from v. 18, yet Jesus has been led to Caiaphas. Widely held but unsupported, is the hypothesis that the two residences adjoined, and had but one court ; but see remarks following v. 27.

The account of the denial of Peter agrees in general with the Synoptic; but the representation is more distinctly unfavourable to Peter; he does not go into the palace at once, like the unknown disciple, v. 15; he is led in by the unknown disciple, v. 16; he does not weep when the cock crows, v. 27.

The obscurities and difficulties of this section are so evident that attempts at re-arrangement have been many. The Syriac palimpsest Ss. (about 500 A. D.) gives the verses in the following order: 13, 24, 14, 15, 19-23, 16-18, 25-27, thus bringing together the verses relating to Peter's denial and representing the hearing as before Caiaphas, and therefore conforming the narrative much more closely to the Synoptic: but this deprives the mention of Annas of all significance, leaves unexplained the "therefore" (*οὕτως*) of v. 24, and the repetition involved in placing v. 25 immediately after v. 18.

Spitta would arrange the verses thus: 13, 19-23, 24, 14, 15-18, 25-27; but this leaves the matter in confusion, since if in vv. 19-23 the hearing is before Caiaphas in the house of Annas, why was Jesus (v. 24) sent to the house of Caiaphas? Therefore some have asserted that v. 24 is to be deleted as an unfortunate textual corruption.

If the hypothesis of a dislocation be set aside as probable but not proven, the explanation of the present order may be found in the relation of the evangelist to the Synoptics. He read from them that there were two sessions of the council (Matt. xxvi. 57; xxvii. 1; Mk. xiv. 53; xv. 1; Luke only knows one: xxii. 66-xxiii. 1), one in the middle of the night, one in the morning; he therefore represents the hearings as held before two high-priests, since he had a tradition of two persons as actually in function as high-priests, though but one was nominally in office; therefore he naturally supposed them resident in different places; since one source (Luke) represents the denial of

Peter as taking place immediately, before the trial, while the others (Matthew and Mark) insert the incident of the denial after the account of the Sanhedrin session, the evangelist has followed both sources.

The repetition from the Synoptics of Peter's denial and the omission of the Synoptic report of the trial before the Sanhedrin are to be explained as due to the author's purpose to give Peter an unfavourable presentation, especially over against "the beloved disciple" (see Introduction, § 7), and to present Jesus as true heavenly ruler over against base and earthly ones.

The saying concerning the temple (Mk. xiv. 58, 59; Matt. xxvi. 61) had been considered in ii. 19-22; the prophecy of a speedy visible return (Mk. xiv. 62; Matt. xxvi. 64) was unfulfilled, and is opposed to the teaching of the farewell discourses; the Jewish people had already rejected Jesus (xii. 36-43), the Mosaic punishment for blasphemy was death by stoning; there was therefore no inducement to use the Synoptic report of the trial before the Sanhedrin.

#### **Trial and condemnation by Pilate, xviii. 28-xix. 16.**

Pilate, the representative of Rome, the earthly kingdom, tries and sentences to death the king of the heavenly kingdom of truth; he seemingly conquers, the real victory is with Jesus; for he moves on majestic and awe-compelling to the divinely appointed end, while Pilate before him is confused, abashed, fear-smitten, vacillating, urged to his final verdict of condemnation by fear of Tiberius and the Jews. The whole process has six parts (Keim): (1) Interview of Pilate and Jews, xviii. 28-32; (2) interview of Pilate and Jesus, vv. 33-37; (3) attempt at rescue, vv. 38-40; (4) second attempt at rescue, xix. 1-6; (5) third attempt, vv. 7-12; (6) sentence, vv. 13-16.

The "*therefore*" of v. 28 is peculiar, since v. 24 mentions no trial.

The *palace* (Prætorium) was either the palace of Herod or the barracks of the Roman cohort in the fortress of Antonia. *It was early*: the judicial sessions could begin at sunrise; the Synoptic record puts the second trial before Caiaphas at this time, Mk. xv. 1.

The reason for the refusal of the Jews to enter the grounds: *that they might eat the Passover*, shows conclusively that the

evangelist wished to represent this trial as taking place in the morning of the 14th Nisan, see xiii. 1, comment.

*Pilate therefore went out (v. 29).*—The account of the trial, until xix. 12, is marked by a recurrent movement of Pilate from the interior of the edifice to the court, and the reverse; the dramatic situation: Jesus within but Jews without, is peculiar to this Gospel; the Synoptics regard the whole procedure as taking place in the court.

The first scene (vv. 29-32) is intended simply to set forth the groundlessness of the movement, the want of real basis for the accusations.

*Pilate*, more fully, *Pontius Pilate*, Matt. xxvii. 2, Lk. iii. 1, was Roman governor or procurator of the province from 26-36 A. D.; the name Pontius indicates descent from an illustrious Samnite family; his residence was in Cæsarea, but he sometimes came to Jerusalem at the time of the great feasts that he might preserve order. His rule was stern; his fate is uncertain; Christian traditions make him a suicide, and both the Tiber and the Rhone refuse his body, which is at length cast into a Swiss lake.

The proposal: *judge him according to your law (v. 31)*, indicates a desire to save the life of Jesus; and shows that the evangelist wished to represent that Jesus had had no legal trial before the Sanhedrin, since there is in the answer of the Jews an apparent assent to Pilate's assumption that there had been no trial. *It is not lawful for us to put any man to death:* herein the evangelist finds a fulfilment of Jesus' word in xii. 32; see also iii. 14; viii. 28; because death at Jewish hands would have been by stoning, and Jesus' destiny was "to be lifted up."

The interview in the Prætorium, vv. 33-38a, is apparently private. The purpose of the evangelist is to explain the true sense of the self-asserted kingship of Jesus: he is truly a king, but not of the Jews nor of this world; his kingdom is of the truth, is not advanced by force, its citizens are not Jews or Greeks by race, but

all men who are of the truth. Hereby the groundlessness of the accusations is proven. In this scene also Jesus is presented a king in dignity; he is the peer of Pilate; questions him as equal in rank, superior in nature. Pilate becomes a symbol; he represents Rome, the world-kingdom; the two kings face each other.

*Art thou the king of the Jews?* (v. 33).—Pilate's acquaintance with the Synoptic accusation (Lk. xxiii. 2, 3) is assumed, though in vv. 29, 30 the Jews have refused to state the crime of Jesus. The emphasis lies upon "*thou*": "thou, poor, foolish peasant, a king"; the question is scornful.

The answer (v. 34) is counter-question, in which the emphasis lies upon "of thyself"; the ignorance of this ruler is set forth in sharpest contrast to the supernatural knowledge of this king in the kingdom of truth; Jesus does not ask in order to be informed; the answer of Pilate (v. 35) reveals his scorn and his failure to understand; the guilt of the Jews is also therein emphasized; Pilate would himself have no fear of danger from this peasant.

While in the Synoptic record (Mk. xv 3, 5; Matt. xxvii. 14) Jesus will not open his lips save for the one word, "Thou sayest," we have in vv. 36, 37 an announcement and explanation concerning the kingdom and its king. See above, the introduction to vv. 33-38a.

The pre-existence is naturally but not necessarily to be inferred from the words: *to this end am I come into the world*: the *truth* is the whole body of verities which are comprised in the complete knowledge of God.

*What is truth?* (v. 38).—The question is to be regarded as arising from a condition of confusion not unmixed with fear (xix. 8); it is not so much scorn or scepticism which prompts the question; the misapprehension and confusion which the lofty teaching caused in the mind of Nicodemus, the teacher of the Jews, was less than that which visits Pilate the Roman, the representative of the kingdom of this world; his unreceptive mind can only respond with a foolish

question: what is truth anyway?; in *the* truth he has no interest.

Pilate is so impressed and cowed by the majesty of this king of men (xix. 8) that he makes a first attempt to save him, *vv.* 38b-40, by proposing that Jesus should be set free in accordance with a custom of freeing some prisoner as a token of grace at this Passover feast; but the Jews demand the release of one Barabbas, here called a *robber*, but described in Mark (xv. 7) as an insurgent. In the Synoptics this incident is more prominent and is the last, as it is the only, attempt of Pilate to deliver Jesus, see Matt. xxvii. 15-26; Mk. xv. 6-15; Lk. xxiii. 16-25.

The scourging and mocking (xix. 1-3) apparently take place in the Prætorium. In the first two Gospels they follow the sentence of the governor; Luke omits the scourging but attributes the mocking to Herod and his men of war before the return of Jesus to the residence of Pilate for sentence; this Gospel agrees with Luke in placing the incident before the close of the trial, but with the first two in locating it in the Prætorium. By this means the mockery, as the scourging, is largely deprived of its significance; it becomes, as is the import of the proposal in Luke xxiii. 16, 22, a means adopted for conciliation of the Jews, while in the earlier Gospels it is the usual punishment inflicted before crucifixion. The smiting on the face is in the Synoptics connected with the hearing before the Sanhedrin, Matt. xxvi. 67; Mk. xiv. 65; Matt. adds the placing a reed as a mock sceptre in the hands of Jesus, and a smiting therewith afterward. Then, to excite compassion or a derision which will mitigate hatred, Pilate brings out Jesus; surely the people will laugh when they see Jesus, the scourged, with mimic crown and a soldier's old cloak, beside a Pilate in regal clothing.

*Behold, the man* (v. 6).—This is to be regarded as of pregnant meaning. As regards the relations of Pilate and the

Jews, it is scornful and depreciative; "here is the man you profess to fear, scourged, mocked, the incarnation of helplessness, is not pity for such a fanatic better than hate?" But since the author is clearly anxious to represent Pilate as profoundly impressed, awed, even cowed by the majesty of Jesus; dimly conscious of something unearthly and miraculous in him, hence himself shaken, timid, uncertain; we may accept Nestle's suggestion (*Einf. in d. griesch. N. T.*, 237-8) that the word ἄνθρωπος here is intended also to convey the idea of the Son of Man (Bar Nasa) in the Johannine sense, see i. 51; iii. 14, comment: thus Pilate, like Caiaphas, xi. 49-52, becomes an involuntary prophet.

*Take him yourselves and crucify him.*—Since the Jews had no legal right to crucify, this utterance of Pilate is to be regarded as scornful: Pilate will show them their impotence; this significance is supported by the reply of the Jews in the following verse.

*We have a law (v. 7).*—The reference is to Lev xxiv. 16; for the charges against Jesus before the Sanhedrin, see Mk. xiv. 61-64; Matt. xxvi. 62-66; Pilate, as a polytheist, understands the phrase *Son of God* to denote a hero of divine parentage. His apprehension of the presence of some truly divine being increases; his fear intensifies; he takes Jesus within the privacy of the Prætorium for further examination.

*Whence art thou? (v. 9).*—A presentiment of the heavenly origin of Jesus comes to Pilate: the question is in Johannine style, see vii. 27; viii. 14; ix. 29, 30. The silence of Jesus is to be regarded as due neither to his conviction of Pilate's hopeless stupidity, nor to a perception that an explanation to Pilate would cause his release and therefore defeat the divine purpose, iii. 14, but simply to his sovereign pleasure; when the king will, he becomes silent; and as Pilate finds cause of offence in this (v. 10), Jesus reminds him (v. 11) that his earthly power has its source in a heavenly power:

since he is only the divinely established agent (Rom. xiii. 1) to carry out a higher decree, he is less guilty than Caiaphas, who delivered Jesus over, since his act was both illegal and more free.

At the last attempt to rescue Jesus (v. 12) Pilate's fear before Jesus is made to disappear before another more tangible and vital: the wrath of Tiberius may be visited upon the governor who shields pretenders to royalty. Between the Roman Cæsar and the king of the heavenly realm of truth Pilate must choose. He hesitates no longer.

*The Pavement* (v. 13) was presumably a square in front of the Prætorium; there the seat of judgment was placed. Gabbatha means "hill" or "elevation."

*The Preparation* (v. 14) is here specified as that of *the Passover*; while in the Synoptics the word (παρασκευή) is distinctly stated to designate the day before the Sabbath, Mk. xv. 42; on the difference in chronology see xiii. 1, comment. The *sixth hour* was noon, since the period from sunrise to sunset was usually divided into twelve parts. Westcott (282) finds slight evidence that in Asia Minor the hours were reckoned from midnight; therefore here the sixth hour is 6 A. M.; but this is surely too early, as the noon hour is too late if the Synoptic statement is correct. The true meaning is ideal; the hour of Jesus' earthly judgment is his spiritual noon, the sun is at its zenith; at that hour the Passover lamb was slaughtered. Mark puts the crucifixion at 9 A. M. (xv. 25); Matt. and Luke are somewhat indefinite, apparently follow Mark, since they agree in other items of chronology.

*Behold, your king!*—The utterance is, like that of v. 5, of pregnant meaning; from Pilate the governor it is grim irony; from Pilate the semi-conscious prophet it is loftiest truth.

*We have no king but Cæsar* (v. 15).—The Jews surpass Pilate in their loyalty to Cæsar; and receive into their



charge the person of Jesus; it is really they who by means of the soldiers are to crucify their own true king.

While the Synoptics attach much importance to the trial by the Sanhedrin, in the fourth Gospel it is only present by uncertain implication, and the hearing before Pilate is of correspondingly great prominence. The narrative shows traces of dependence upon the Synoptic record, especially Luke; *e. g.*, compare xviii. 22 with Mk. xiv. 65; xviii. 33 with Mk. xv. 2, Lk. xxiii. 3; xviii. 38 with Lk. xxiii. 4; xviii. 39 with Mk. xv. 9; xix. 2 with Matt. xxvii. 29; xix. 1 with Lk. xxiii. 16, 22; apparently from Luke come the heightened political interest and the threefold declaration of the innocence of Jesus. The presentation shows the general traits of the Gospel; Rome has its symbolic representative in Pilate as Christianity in Jesus; the political harmlessness of Christianity is set forth so sharply as to make the section a true apologetic for the use of Christians in the days of Domitian or Trajan; above all, the figure of Christ the king, pre-existent, heavenly, peer of Pilate or Cæsar, unshaken, victorious, is outlined in sharpest contrast to the heathen ruler, confused, timid, hesitating, defeated even in giving sentence of death. The presence of unhistorical elements through the influence of the ideal appears in such features as the sauciness of the Jews, xviii. 30, the representation of Pilate as timid and wavering and repeatedly moving as a weakling from Jesus to the multitude and the reverse, the citation of conversations with Pilate when no disciple was present, the representation of Jesus as not taciturn (as in the Synoptics) but voluble; and anxious to guard himself from the suspicion of political dangerousness.

#### The death and burial of Jesus, xix. 17-42.

Jesus the king goes on his way to triumphal glory, bears his own cross, v. 17; is crucified, with the affixed title of king, vv. 18-22; the Scripture is fulfilled in the division of his garments, vv. 23-25; in his death (as a Passover lamb) without broken bones, and in the piercing of his side from which flow the miraculous blood and water (the spirit, symbolised by the sacraments), vv. 28-37; he is buried in a new tomb by Joseph and Nicodemus, vv. 38-42.

*Bearing the cross for himself (v. 17).*—The carefully chosen expression shows that the evangelist intended to correct the impression produced by the Synoptics, who make the soldiers

force into that service one Simon of Cyrene (Mk. xv. 21). Such a procedure might easily warrant the sneer that Jesus was unmanned and weak from his sentence: the Johannine Christ goes as a triumphant king, strong and resolute, to meet his fate. The cross was also a fitting symbol for the sins which the Lamb of God bears away, i. 29.

*Golgotha*: "skull," probably so called from its contour, not from being a stated place of executions (Jerome says that there was a tradition that Adam's skull was deposited there): the location is unknown; since the fourth century tradition has settled upon the place where now stands the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

*Two other* (v. 18): robbers, according to Matt. and Mark; the fourth Gospel prefers to present Jesus as apart from publicans and sinners, therefore also the omission of Luke xxiii. 40-43; the position of Jesus *in the midst* is one of honour.

The title and the objection of the Jews to it (vv. 19-22) reveal more clearly the purpose of the author to make Pilate figure as a semi-prophet a king rendering homage, unconscious but significant, to the real king. The inclusion of the word *Nazareth*, which is not in the Synoptics, makes the paradox more significant. *Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?* i. 46. The three languages signify the universality of Christianity.

*The garments* (v. 23).—The word *ἱμάτια* here indicates the outer clothing; the *four parts* are a symbol of the four quarters of the world, the act therefore prophetic of the diffusion of Christianity: the feature of four soldiers probably comes from Acts xii. 4. The *coat* (χιτῶν, *tunic*) was the shirt-like inner garment; here *woven from the top*, an "aristocratic garment," like the high-priestly according to Josephus, *Ant.*, iii., 7, 4; here it is representative of the inner regal dignity of Jesus, and of the union of his Church.

The disposal of this by lot (v. 24) is presented by the

evangelist, following Matt. xxvii. 35, as a fulfilment of Ps. xxii. 18; which in the original is not prophecy but descriptive of the sufferings of the faithful Jewish Church in the days of Artaxerxes I.; of the two lines of the verse (see Revised Version) the second is simply a repetition of the thought of the first, after the manner of Jewish poetry, and does not indicate a separate act; the evangelist considers them as two successive events, finds the first fulfilled in the division of the outer garments, the second in disposal of the tunic by lot; for a similar use of Scripture see Matt. xxi. 2.

To *these things* which *the soldiers did* are now set in contrast the things which were done by Jesus and the group around the cross. In the Synoptics all the disciples have fled, only women (and acquaintances, Luke) stand afar off, beholding. Here a group stand by the cross; whether the women are three or four cannot be determined; Mary of Clopas may be the person referred to as sister of Mary the mother of Jesus, but it is not probable that two sisters would have the same name; some find the unnamed sister of Mary in the Joanna of Luke xxiv. 10, others in the Salome of Mk. xv. 40; xvi. 1; others regard Clopas as a brother of Joseph and this Mary as his daughter, therefore a cousin of Jesus; some identify Clopas with the Alphæus of Mk. iii. 18; Mary Magdalene is mentioned (with one exception, Lk. viii. 2) only in connection with the cross and the sepulchre, while Magdala was probably a Galilean village near Tiberias; the mother of Jesus is mentioned in none of the Synoptics in connection with these last events in Jerusalem; the suggestion may have come from Acts i. 14.

On the *disciple whom he loved* (v. 26) see xiii. 23, and Introduction, § 7.

*Woman* as ii. 4, see comment. One expects here the most tender of words. Luthardt (as Westcott) explains that for the "calling" of Jesus Mary was not his mother, and that with the word "woman" he now at the end of his

ministry completely loosens the bond of earthly sonship which he had in part loosened by the use of the same word in Cana at the beginning of his "heavenly calling." How cold, yet true to the Johannine representation of Christ. But the word "woman" is here, as in ii. 4, more symbolic than personal, represents the true Israel, the Church as in Rev. xii. 1-6, now given over to the guidance of the beloved disciple, who is thus par excellence distinguished as having become the spiritual brother of Jesus and his vicar in the *inner* guidance of the Church, as Peter in the *outer*.

This feature of the agonised mother at the cross of her dying son is in itself so tender and touching that historical criticism might well turn with reverent face away had not the author himself shown in his use of the word "woman" (see above, 26) and by his four-fold: "behold, the man," v. 5; "behold, your king," v. 14; "behold, thy son," v. 26; "behold, thy mother," v. 27, how small was the significance of the historical and personal, how determinative was the doctrinal and symbolic. When one reflects that (a) the Synoptics, which give the traditions from the circle of the Galilean disciples: James, Peter, John, present many details from the scene of the crucifixion, yet are silent as to this; (b) all the Gospels make no mention of any presence of Mary at the sepulchre or at any meetings of the risen Jesus with his disciples; (c) in Acts i. 14 Mary appears to be among the women of Galilee and her own sons; (d) Mary had her own sons and daughters with whom to reside, and that there is not the slightest hint in the Gospels that during the public ministry of Jesus his mother was under his care or maintenance or responsibility rather than of his brothers, but that the precise contrary is clearly indicated in the whole tenor of the Gospels and particularly in Matt. viii. 20, 22; xii. 46-50; xiii. 53-58; Mk. iii. 31-35; (e) no connection of Mary with John or the other apostles after the feast of Pentecost appears in Acts; (f) the purpose of the section is to set forth John as the successor of Jesus rather than his own brother James or Peter; (g) the Gospel magnifies "the disciple whom Jesus loved," see Introduction § 7—when one considers all this, the artificial and ideal character of the incident can with difficulty be questioned. Since John Mark with his mother Mary resided at Jerusalem (Acts xii. 12), it is possible that there is here a confusion of traditions.

*I thirst* (v. 28).—The narrative of the crucifixion presents no indication of pain or weakness. While in the earlier Synoptic tradition the despairing cry, *Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani* (Mk. xv. 34; Matt. xxvii. 46), is the cause of the last offering of drink, this cry and the drinking are omitted in Luke, while our evangelist not only omits the cry but represents the words *I thirst* as uttered that *the Scriptures might be accomplished*, see Ps. lxix. 21.

*Vinegar* (v. 29) was a sour wine, made from the skins of pressed grapes. The *hyssop* was a low wall-growing plant; hence many have conjectured that the word originally in the text was ὑσσώπῳ, "upon a javelin"; Matt. and Mark have the word "reed."

*It is finished* (v. 30).—The verb has no subject; the connection with v. 28 indicates that the real subject is "my predestined and prophesied work"; see iv. 34. This done, it only remains for the pre-existent Logos-Christ to leave the world and go unto the Father, xvi. 28; therefore the expression of initiative activity: he *gave up his spirit*; it was not forced from him. In place of this Matt. and Mark have a last loud inarticulate cry; Luke the quotation of Ps. xxxi. 5 (Matt. xxvii. 50; Mk. xv. 37; Lk. xxiii. 46).

*The Preparation* (v. 31): of the Passover (see xix. 14, comment): which was also a *high Sabbath* day according to the Mosaic law. A hanged (crucified) person must not remain unburied over night; Deut. xxi. 23; the Romans left the bodies upon the cross.

The breaking of the legs of criminals upon the cross was sometimes practised, especially upon slaves; it was no merciful provision for hastening death; but an act of cruelty.

*One of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side* (v. 34): the purpose was therefore not to produce death, but to test its presence, since blood will not flow from a corpse: then appeared the miracle; not only *blood* poured forth but also *water*: not in mixture but separate.

Many attempts have been made, by conservatives and rationalists alike, to give a natural explanation : (a) an actual bursting of the heart which caused premature death (Dr. S. Houghton, *Speakers Comm.* on 1 John v. 6); (b) only apparent death or swoon, so that the blood was still fluid, death caused by the wound; (c) the water was the pericardial fluid, which however is pale yellow. But the true explanation is found in the symbolic significance, as well as in the direct implication that his body was not as the bodies of men : the flowing of blood and water showed that it was still miraculously alive, although in the ordinary sense dead. For blood and water are to the writer (1 John v. 6-8) symbols of the holy sacraments, as also the means whereby the salvatory energies are continued in the Church; water is a symbol of the spirit, vii. 38, 39, as is blood in vi. 53-56, and thus from Christ flows this spirit as the water and blood of the sacraments.

*He that hath seen hath borne witness (v. 35).*—The preceding statement is of such consequence that its veracity is now most emphatically affirmed. But the importance lies not in the fact which as fact is *trivial* and *ambiguous*; it lies in the *interpretation*, the *ideal significance*. Thus “the essence of the narrative is a spiritual fact”; and “*he that hath seen*” (ὁ ἑωρακώς) is not the witness of any physical event; but the interpreter; his *witness* is not of the present but something that *he hath borne*, and also ideal, not external; it is to be found in 1 John v. 6-8.

*He knoweth that he saith true* would be strangely tautological if “he” were the same person as the previous “he that hath seen.” Since the passage so strongly resembles 1 John v. 5-10 (“spirit,” “water,” “blood,” “witness,” “believe,” etc.) the word ἐκεῖνος, “he,” “that one,” is to be understood according to its use in the first Epistle, where it denotes Christ. The sense, therefore, is: Christ knows that this disciple’s spiritual interpretation is true: so that when ye accept this as having Christ’s sanction ye also may believe it.

*A bone of him shall not be broken (v. 36).*—A quotation from Ps. xxxiv. 20; there spoken of Jehovah’s care of the righteous man, here used as prophetic of Messiah, the Lamb

of God, i. 29, slain at the Passover with no bone broken (Ex. xii. 46; Numb. ix. 12).

*They shall look on him whom they pierced* (v. 37).—Quoted from Zech. xii. 10; where it refers to some then well-known sufferer for the Jewish faith under the Persian or Seleucidæan rule. Here the Jews, not the soldiers, are the subject. In Rev. i. 7 and Justin, *Apol.*, i., 52, the prophecy is to be fulfilled at the Parousia: the evangelist finds its fulfilment at the crucifixion.

*Joseph of Arimathea* (v. 38).—He is mentioned only in the Gospels (Mk. xv. 43, 45; Matt. xxvii. 57, 59; Lk. xxiii. 5) and in the Gospel of Peter, 2, where he is called "the friend of Pilate and the Lord." *Arimathea* (Ramathaim Zophim) lay near Lydda, therefore near the sea. See iii. 1, comment.

*Nicodemus* (v. 39) is to be connected with the ruler of iii. 1, see comment; it is possible that he is the Nicodemon of Josephus (*Ant.*, iv, 3, 2) who was "rich," "a counsellor"; that he was confused (see Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, vi., 263, E. A. Abbott in *Enc. Bib.*) with Joseph of Arimathea, and thus the one person here appears as two. This tradition of a rich Nicodemon agrees with the feature of the *one hundred pound weight of myrrh and aloes*, here apparently pulverised and mixed; the amount is enormous; some suppose the material was to be spread out as a couch, 2 Chron. xvi. 14. This is in verbal agreement with the unquoted clause of Is. liii. 9: *with the rich in his death*.

*Linen cloths* (v. 40): strips of linen; the process described was a Jewish method of embalming: the Synoptics mention no embalming and exclude it by representing the women as preparing to embalm the body as soon as the Sabbath was over (Mk. xvi. 1; Lk. xxiv. 1).

*A garden* (v. 41).—According to Matt. xxvii. 60 the tomb was Joseph's; here the supposition appears to be the contrary; the place was used because it was *nigh at hand*, and because of the nearness of the Preparation (see v 31, com-

ment) haste was necessary. But there is nothing improbable in the ownership of the tomb by Joseph (or Nicodemon, v. 39, above); the newness of the tomb is mentioned by all; John omits mention of the stone (Golai) which closed the entrance.

One can with difficulty understand why the Synoptic features of the darkness, and the rending of the veil (Mk. xv. 33, 38 and parallels) were omitted; the crucifixion is pictured by the evangelist as an event of kingly triumph, for which darkness would be inappropriate; and the miracle of fulness in the gushing forth of the blood and water is much more fitting than the negative and destructive one of the rending of the veil.

An intimation of the use of divergent traditions lies in the relation of v. 31 to v. 38; Pilate had already arranged for the removal of the crucified three. No satisfactory solution can be given to the problem of the absence of the disciples and relatives from the narrative concerning the requests made to Pilate for the body of Jesus; surely they, especially the group at the cross, would be expected to claim the body rather than two persons "secretly" disciples.

### The Resurrection, xx. 1-31.

Jesus, king triumphant over death, manifests himself to **Mary Magdalene** the representative of Love, vv. 1-18; to the disciples as representatives of Faith (the nameless disciple taking precedence in belief, v. 8), vv. 19-24; to Thomas (in the presence of the other disciples) as the representative of Doubt, vv. 24-29. When the ascended Messiah has become glorified as heavenly king at the right hand of his Father, as a spiritual sovereign he returns to give his disciples plenipotentiary power, vv. 22, 23, and conquer doubt, vv. 26-29; then manifestations cease.

*Mary Magdalene* (xx. 1.)—See xix. 25; Mk. xvi. 1 adds Mary of James and Salome; Mark—Appendix xvi. 9 is either from John or a like tradition.

*While it was yet dark* agrees with Matt. xxviii. 1 and Luke xxiv. 1; in Mk. xvi. 2 it was sunrise.

*Seeth the stone taken away from the tomb*: the stone was not mentioned in xix. 42, but the Synoptic narrative is



presupposed. In Matt. xxviii. 2 there is an earthquake; the women see an angel descend and roll away the stone. In the Gospel of Peter two angels have already come, the stone rolls away of itself; the two angels enter; three emerge (the third being Jesus, and a cross following), then "a certain man" descends into the tomb from the opened heaven; the soldiers, elders, and centurions see all these things and report them to Pilate; then comes Mary Magdalene with her "friends," etc.

While in Mark and Luke the early visit is for the purpose of embalmment, here that act has been completed xix. 39, 40, and the coming is prompted only by pure love and sorrow.

*She runneth therefore (v. 2):* is on that account not present at the angelic appearance to the other women, Mk. xvi. 5-8. On *Simon Peter* and the *other disciple whom Jesus loved*, see Introduction § 7; here they appear as already in the same house or court. "*They*" refers to the Jews; "*we*" either presupposes the presence of the other women at the tomb or is the common consciousness of the bereaved Church searching for its Lord.

The order and precision in the grave clothes (*v. 6*) indicates the solemn deliberateness of him who had *power to lay down his life* and *power to take it again*, x. 18; and is as well confutation of the opponents who asserted that the body of Jesus had been stolen by enemies or borne away by friends.

The word "*believed*" (*v. 8*) has as its object, specifically, the resurrection of Jesus; therein consists the pre-eminence of the unknown disciple; he is first at the sepulchre, *i. e.*, he first comes to belief, he outruns Peter in spiritual apprehension; though neither has any knowledge of Scripture prophecy (*v. 9*), this disciple needs none. In Luke xxiv. 26, 46, the theme of Jesus' post-resurrection instruction is the Scripture warrant for his resurrection.

To the negative testimony of the tenantless tomb is now added the positive evidence of Mary, vv. 11-18, the vision of angels and of Jesus.

*Mary was standing weeping* (v. 11): as representative of Love, she cannot, like the disciple representative of Faith, return home.

*She beholdeth two angels in white* (v. 12).—Peter and “the other disciple” had not seen them: the spiritual beings are visible only to those who are in the vision condition; this is the case now in the Orient. This feature is from Lk. xxiv. 4, and is meaningless here, since the angels only ask what must be for them a superfluous question (v. 13) in answer to which Mary repeats v. 2. In Mk. xvi. 1-6, Matt. xxviii. 1-10, the women see one angel who announces the resurrection and bids them tell the disciples.

*She knew not that it was Jesus* (v. 14).—Perhaps the author had before his eyes Lk. xxiv. 16. Both in the earlier and later traditions there is evident the idea of a changed corporeity, not subject to the usual limitations of material substance. The body appears and disappears suddenly; is apparently garmentless, v. 20; Paulus suggested that Mary’s failure to recognise Jesus was due to his having obtained the gardener’s clothing; but the realistic impulse reverently avoided such detail.

*Touch me not* (v. 17).—The verb sometimes means to *seize, lay hold of*, which involves the idea of detaining: that this is its meaning here is indicated by the following clause. The thought is that the work of Christ is not completed until he shall have ascended to the Father, been glorified by him (xvii. 5), and have returned to his own, xiv. 18; until then even pure Love as represented by the Magdalene must not strive to detain him. The positive command: *go unto my brethren*, etc., further emphasizes the thought: as I must not for affection’s sake delay a moment, so for you this is no time for emotion; go, spread the tidings. Here only in the

reported words of Jesus are the disciples called brothers, here only is God called their Father.

In this Gospel therefore the (first) Ascension must be conceived as immediately following the interview with Mary, and every Christophany implies a descent from heaven; on the Ascension as a single event and final departure see Acts i. 10, comment.

To the Christophany of the woman (women in Matt. xxviii. 9, 10) now succeeds that of the disciples.

*That day* (v. 19): see v. 1; therefore, on the same day as the resurrection. *When the doors were shut* the incident is mentioned to set forth the conception that the body of Jesus was not a gross fleshly organism, but a heavenly corporeity, freed from the usual limitations of mundane existence. The disciples are apparently the ten; Judas and Thomas absent, v. 24; the account resembles Luke xxiv. 36, 37.

The *hands and the side* (v. 20) are displayed (not the feet, as in Lk. xxiv. 40) in order to prove identity, since the message of Mary was received with incredulity.

*As the Father hath sent me*, etc. (vv. 21-23).—This is the actual fulfilment of the ideal of xvii. 18; the formal commission corresponding to Matt. xxviii. 19; Lk. xxiv. 47; Acts i. 8; the endowment with the Holy Spirit; in this way the close connection of Christ and the Spirit is made very manifest: for parallels to v. 23, see Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18. Weiss (*Leben Jesu*, ii., 615) denies that this endowment of the Spirit is the fulfilment of the promise to send the Paraclete because the Paraclete was to be sent by the Father in place of the departed Jesus: but his objections overlook (or deny) the fact that Jesus also promised to send the Paraclete (xv. 26); that he had himself gone from them in the Ascension (see v. 17, comment); it is true that we have a symbolic or verbal difference, since in the one case the Paraclete is sent, in the other brought or imparted; but

this obscurity is characteristic of the representation of the Paraclete; see xiv. 16, comment.

Only when this Spirit is given are the disciples (apostles) qualified to exercise the power of remitting and retaining sins, *i. e.*, have become church officials: a post-apostolic conception (McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, pp. 44-47).

On the characteristics of Thomas (vv. 24, 25) see xi. 16, xiv. 15, comment. He now appears as a representative of doubt overcome, vv. 26-29, and the Gnostic conception of seeming corporeity is disproved.

*After eight days (v. 26): i.e.*, on the next Sunday. The features of v. 19: shut doors and formal greeting, are repeated. Jesus, as the omniscient, knows what Thomas said in his absence (v. 25), and grants to him the desired test.

*My Lord and my God (v. 28).*—The transition is from doubt to complete faith; the word God here designates the belief of Thomas as ideal from the Johannine point of view; the confession is the goal; the theory of i. 1 is here realised in act; on *θεός* as "divine being," see i. 1, comment.

*Because thou hast seen me (v. 29).*—The justified inference is that the evangelist desires to show that Thomas believed *without* the test of touch; the sight of Jesus was enough. The interrogative: *hast thou believed?* is preferable; the question is reproof. In the last saying of Jesus, which follows the interrogation, the superiority of a faith which needs no external support, which is a free act of the spirit is set forth in the form of a blessing; such a faith was that of the ideal disciple, v. 10; while not entirely divorced from sight, since it sees the empty tomb, it demands no tangible evidence.

*Many other signs (v. 30).*—The Gospel history is conceived as a series of signs or proofs that Jesus is the Son of God; among the *many others* the Synoptic miracles may be included; the post-resurrection appearances are thus among the deeds of Jesus.

*The Son of God* (v. 31).—The phrase is not equivalent to, but explicative of, the preceding word Messiah: since the “ye” for whom the book is written are already Christians, the purpose cannot be stated as conversion to simple faith in Jesus as Messiah; nor can the word “believe” mean “confirm in the faith”; the purpose is to lead Messianic believers to a new belief: that this Jesus the Messiah is the Son of God as the Logos of i. 1 and the *θεός* of i. 1 and xx. 28; and that in the higher Christology they may find *life*, i. e., the completion of salvation. See i. 1, comment, and Introduction § 1.

The Christophanies of this chapter are, like those of Luke, confined to Jerusalem and vicinity; unlike Luke, Mark (xv. 1-8), and Paul (1 Cor. xv. 3-8) they include an appearance to the female sex. While a knowledge of the Synoptic narratives is apparent (comp. vv. 3-9 with Lk. xxiv. 24; v. 12 with Lk. xxiv. 4; vv. 11-18 with Matt. xxviii. 9, 10; vv. 20, 27 with Lk. xxiv. 36), the delineation abounds in Johananine characteristics. The appearances are limited to three; they symbolise Love, Faith, and Doubt in their relation to the resurrection; the rivalry between Peter and the nameless disciple is also introduced here; the ideas of the farewell discourses are set forth in the features of the narratives; the gift of the spirit follows immediately upon the resurrection and a first ascension, and is communicated by the breath of the glorified Saviour; the delineation shows anxiety to avoid a Gnostic Docetism as well as a gross materialism; the series is brought to an end when the theme of the prologue: *and the word was God*, issues from the lips of Thomas the representative of Doubt, itself unable longer to resist.

As to the resurrection-theories see Cary, Vol. I. of this series, pp. 325-331.

The outlook into the future, ch. xxi. 1-25.

Jesus appears at the sea of Galilee to seven of his disciples, miraculously aids them to secure an immense catch of fish, and then gives them a sacred meal, vv. 1-14; he restores Peter to favour and confides to him external leadership in the Church, vv. 15-17; he prophesies the contrasted fates of Peter and “the beloved disciple”; the one is to die a martyr’s death, the other to tarry long; vv. 18-23. All this becomes symbol: Jesus assists to its success the

missionary endeavour of the Church and feeds the believers with his life; Peter represents the beginning and the outward in the Apostolic Age, especially its lower Christology; "the beloved disciple" its close, its higher Christology, and its abiding spirit.

*After these things* (xxi. 1): as v. 1; vi. 1; vii. 1.

*The sea of Tiberias*: a late name for the sea of Galilee; it elsewhere appears first in the second century A.D.: elsewhere in the New Test. it is called "of Galilee," or "of Gennesaret."

*There were together Simon Peter, etc.* (v. 2).—Peter is first (Andrew here unmentioned, not so in *Gospel of Peter*, 14); as to Thomas see xi. 16; Nathanael has not been mentioned since i. 45-49; the sons of Zebedee do not elsewhere appear; the *Gospel of Peter*, 14, says that Levi went with Simon and Andrew on a fishing voyage; he may have been included, in some tradition, among those here unnamed. The whole number is therefore seven; a favourite numeral, often expressive of completion; here the number may be also chosen because the following meal has eucharistic significance.

*They knew not* (v. 4): as Mary, xx. 14: in its original connection the manifestation was a first one, but is here made a third; see v. 14, comment.

*Children* (v. 5): as 1 John ii. 13, 18, where also it means all believers. The word (πρὸς φάγινον) here translated "ought to eat" means "something eaten with other food," here, therefore, fishes; the word μή is interrogative presupposing a negative answer; "you have no fish, have you?" Jesus knows that they have none: "apart from me ye can do nothing"; xv. 5.

*The right side* (v. 6).—In the symbolism of the narrative, the phrase denotes the Gentile world, as the unmentioned left, where no success is found, is the Jewish. Peter is not, as in Acts x.-xi., the initiator of the Gentile mission, he toils with the rest; but see v. 11.

In *v. 7* the characteristic presentation of Peter and the "disciple whom Jesus loved" finds another expression; Peter is the man of action, but the other of insight; Peter must learn from him who the stranger is.

The *coat* was a fisherman's blouse.

*Two hundred cubits (v. 8)*: about 300 feet; 200 is to Philo a symbol of repentance.

The food of *v. 9* is evidently conceived as provided by miracle, as *vi. 5-11*: he who is the bread of life feeds his own when he will; but he wills that his disciples aid him, therefore (*v. 10*), "Bring of your fish," etc.

The number of the fishes (*v. 11*) is symbolical, was so recognised in antiquity: most probable is the explanation that the fish are symbolic of the whole heathen world, since according to the *Halieutica* of Oppian—confirmed by others—the different species of fish numbered 153. The unrent net is representative of the undivided Church; thus in *x. 16* after the Gentile sheep are brought in there is still but one flock. In *Luke v. 7* the catch of fish is brought to land in two boats; the Jewish and Gentile churches still have a distinct line of demarcation.

*None of the disciples durst inquire of him (v. 12)*.—This is a feature indicating the awe and fear at a first appearance: the meal is passed in utter silence; the disciples know, through the "disciple whom Jesus loved" (*v. 7*), that the host is no earthly being, but the glorified Lord.

*Jesus cometh (v. 13)*: he is already there, yet in the meal *he cometh*; the allegorical reference to the Lord's supper is clear.

*This is the third time (v. 14)*.—See *xx. 19, 26*; though the features of the narrative indicate that it was originally descriptive of a first appearance, it is by this verse adjusted to the preceding material; as a first in Galilee, it is the third only by omission of the vision of Mary, *John xx. 11-18*; of the women, *Matt. xxviii. 9, 10*; of Peter, *Lk. xxiv. 34*; *1 Cor. xv. 5*; of the two disciples, *Lk. xxiv. 13-35*.

The future for Peter: rehabilitation, station, martyrdom; vv. 15-19.

The scene is private; Jesus and Peter are *near* (τοῦτων, "these" v. 15) but not *with* (ἀκολουθοῦντα, "following," v. 20) the disciples.

To the threefold denial (xviii. 15-27) corresponds the threefold question and answer. The love of Peter (xiii. 37) finds its true sequences in his supreme position in the Church and in his martyrdom. The two words ἀγαπάω and φιλέω are here used without distinction; in many instances the first denotes a love grounded on moral will, the latter love as arising from sense and social relations: βόσκω ("feed") and ποιμαίνω ("tend") are here synonymous, and express the idea that the care and guidance of the Church is here committed in a peculiar degree to Peter: the section thus becomes a parallel to the famous Peter saying inserted into Matthew (xvi. 18, 19): Peter is restored to his position: the fourth Gospel now can be well received in Rome and the West.

*Thou girdest thyself* (v. 18).—The expression refers distinctly to vv. 3, 7, 11; the activity of Peter as missionary and pastor is here described; over against this activity of the younger years is now put the passivity of the martyrdom: *thou shalt stretch forth thy hands* refers literally to the lifting of the hands and arms when one has a band put around him, but symbolically to the martyrdom; the reference to crucifixion is not explicit, as death by beheadal might follow the being dragged away.

*Follow me* (v. 19) is to be understood in a double sense: since the party is slowly moving along the shore it is a simple command or request to keep near, but symbolically it is a command to Peter to follow Jesus unto a martyr's death.

In vv. 20-23 we have a delineation of the future for the beloved disciple: he is less prominent than Peter, but next him in eminence; he is to outlive all the rest but die before



the Parousia. The word *tarry* (v. 22) signifies to remain in life; "*I come*" denotes the Parousia as visible event.

The *saying* (v. 23) must have circulated as coming from the mouth of Jesus in a categorical form, which now after the death of this beloved disciple—be he the apostle, the "Elder," or the apocalyptic writer—must be changed into a conditional one, and thereby loses its prophetic force; and here becomes of chief significance as a rebuke to Peter for idle curiosity; in its allegorical meaning it sets forth the continuance of the higher Christology.

*This is the disciple*, etc. (v. 24).—Concerning this verse it is to be affirmed: (a) it ascribes to "the beloved disciple" of vv. 20-23 the authorship of the whole Gospel, since the words *τούτων* and *ταῦτα* ("these things") refer neither to the first twenty chapters only as Weiss affirms, nor to the appendix only as Meyer asserts; the sentence is unmeaning unless the word *οὗτος* ("this") refers to "the beloved disciple" of v. 23: (b) this verse therefore cannot be separated from vv. 20-23: (c) the death of "the beloved disciple" is to be inferred from the preceding verses, but the author (or authors) of v. 24 overlooked or knowingly disregarded it: (d) the verse is therefore of the nature of a marginal note in which the authorship of the whole Gospel by "the beloved disciple" is mistakenly affirmed by a later group of Christians, whose opinion appears in the word *οἶδαμεν* ("we know").

See, further, Introduction, § 7.

Verse 25 is absent from Cod. Sin., and appears in various forms in other early manuscripts; it is probably a conclusion added very early; its overstatement is apparently based upon xx. 30.

It is agreed by nearly all scholars—Jülicher, *Introduction*, pp. 393-5, is the most recent dissenter—that this Gospel originally ended with xx. 31, and thus that chapter xxi. is a supplement.

Two important characteristics favour the conclusion that the appendix is by the author of chapters i.-xx.: the linguistic features are

largely similar, and the figurative and symbolic are equally prominent. Yet it must be conceded that conscious imitation could achieve such a result; authorship in the same circle of discipleship might even produce it without intention. On the other hand many considerations favour the inference of separate authorship: (a) there are distinct linguistic peculiarities; (b) the material of vv. 1-14 clearly indicates that in its original setting it narrated a first appearance to the disciples as in its parallel in the Peter gospel; (c) chapters xx. and xxi. are not adjusted as they would be if from the same author, since xxi. 1-13 is a fourth appearance of Jesus (xxi. 14); (d) the doctrinal aspect of the Parousia is different (see comment on xiv. 4; compare xxi. 23); (e) the symmetry of the Gospel is complete in seven "signs," and three manifestations of the risen Christ; this symmetry is destroyed by the appendix.

The narrative of vv. 1-14 manifests so close resemblances to Lk. v. 1-11, that an acquaintance with the latter by the author of the appendix may fairly be inferred. In this appendix there is a return to the tradition of Matthew, Mark, and the Gospel of Peter that the first appearance of Jesus to his disciples (not the women) was in Galilee; the twentieth chapter follows the tradition presented by Luke, according to which the appearances were confined to Jerusalem.

The whole Gospel, therefore, presents to us a combination of the two traditions such as is found in none other: even the spurious ending of Mark (written by Aristion soon after 110 A.D., according to Harnack, *Chron.* 697) manifests no such purpose.

As to the date of the addition of the appendix to the Gospel we have no decisive information; but the absence of any mention of its contents in the spurious ending of Mark (xvi. 9-20), although its author is apparently acquainted with John xx., is noteworthy; and if the fragment be from the time of Justin (Bacon, *Hibbert Journal*, Jan., 1904) composition is, of course, about the middle of the second century. The same conclusion may be drawn from its attempt to adjust the claims of Peter and "the beloved disciple." But it is included in the DIATESSARON of Tatian (160-180 A.D.)



# THE FIRST EPISTLE GENERAL OF JOHN.

---

## INTRODUCTION.

1. This writing is in form a homily rather than a letter; no author's name is prefixed; proper names are absent; its warnings and instructions are for all Christians; the acuteness of Zahn finds special reference to conditions in Asia Minor, but Cerinthian Gnosticism was not confined to that region. Since Irenæus it has remained unquestioned that the polemic is against Gnosticism, especially against its denial of the true humanity of Jesus; ii. 22; iv. 2-5; v. 6. This Gnosticism prides itself on knowledge and fellowship with God, minimises sin, derides law and ordinary morality, denies the true doctrine of the Son and thus loses the Father also, is wanting in true love and brotherhood. Over against these Antichrists (ii. 18, 22) and their moral indifferentism, these unsettling novelties of opinion and practice, the author urges adhesion to the early doctrine of the Church and its fraternal ethic; right belief and love.

2. In doctrinal content, practical aim, and literary form, this so-called epistle closely resembles the fourth Gospel. The agreements are many and striking; the differences are not sufficient to negative the possibility, even the probability, of a common authorship. There is more originality in the Gospel; the epistle is nearer the average Christian thought

of its time, especially in its attitude toward the Parousia; if either is derived it is the epistle which is secondary; but as neither is expressive of the complete thought of its author, there is surely no irrationality in the position that both are products of the same mind, especially if an interval of some years separates their origin.

3. The author hides himself, as is the case with the Gospel. The absence of use of the sayings of Jesus, of Old Test. quotation, of the primitive Christian atmosphere, the lateness of the situation, render improbable composition by any member of the original Apostolic circle. But the author represents a tradition closely connected with some great name or personality; the authority he urges is of the past; there is preponderance of probability in favour of the same solution as that presented in section seven of the introduction to the Gospel of John. If duality of the Gospel authorship is favoured, there is at least plausibility in Pfeleiderer's "guess" that the author of the appendix, John xxi., is also the composer of the epistle.

4. The time of composition was surely not early. The Gnostic schism had taken place, or at least begun. Harnack's dating of the epistle before 110 A.D. is based upon the apparent use of 1 John iv. 2, 3, in the Epistle of Polycarp (ch. vii); but the reverse is quite as probable. The external evidence is much the same as that for the fourth Gospel.

# THE FIRST EPISTLE GENERAL OF JOHN.

---

## COMMENTARY

**Introduction.** The author declares it his joy to write in order that by his presentation of the visibly manifested word which is in its essence life his readers may come into the true fellowship of believers with each other, with the Father, with the Son; i. 1-4.

*That which was from the beginning* (i. 1).—The neuter phrase “that which” (ὃ) relates to Christ, not in his physical manifestation but in his spiritual, pre-existent nature. On the word “*beginning*” see John i. 1, comment; the meaning is probably the same. Since this spiritual, aboriginal being is the same as that which visibly appeared—the appearance being an enfleshment, John i. 14—the neuter is continued in the following clauses, which present this manifested life as also physical: thus the verse—as the following—becomes an initial thrust at the Docetic heresy. In the use of the plural—*we have heard*, etc.—there is expressed, not the attestation of the author as eye-witness, but the common testimony of the apostolic Church over against the heretics. This Word became the man Jesus Christ. On the *Word of life*, here a designation of Christ, see comment on the two terms; John i. 1 and i. 4.

*We have seen it* (v. 2).—The seeing is here essentially spiritual apprehension, as is shown by the assertion that “we,” *i. e.*, the true representatives of the apostolic generation,—he is himself presbyter or “older man,”—declare unto

"you," *i. e.*, the younger Church or present generation, the life which was manifested. Thus the second verse, parenthetical, repetitive of verse 1, is inserted to strengthen the affirmation against the Docetics; and does so by asserting the witness-bearing function of the elder Church.

*Which was with the Father* the pre-existent state; the same preposition (*πρός*) is in John i. 1, *the Word was with God*.

In *vv.* 3 and 4, the twofold object of the epistle is stated: (a) the true Christ is set forth that the readers may by the reception of this doctrine come into fellowship with the writers, *i. e.*, the apostolic generation; and (b) thus through the writing fulfilment of joy may come to the writers.

The conditions of fellowship with God are love, righteous endeavour, repentance of sin, i. 5-ii. 2.

*God is light* (*v.* 5).—Light is here probably a symbol of a divine attribute (Philo calls the nature of God "light"); and as this attribute is here *love* rather than intelligence or wisdom, the affirmation is similar to the last clause of *iv.* 8. God is all love; they that walk in love are in fellowship with him. The darkness is therefore the opposite of love. It is possible that here is a polemic against Gnostic speculation that the divine being must embrace both *φῶς* and *σκοτία*, *light* and *darkness*. As to *φῶς* see John i. 4, comment.

In verses 6 and 7 is combated the hypocritical and haughty spirit which boasts of fellowship with God, yet walks among brethren without love, *i. e.*, *in the darkness*. The practice of love brings fellowship among believers, both with God and with each other.

*The blood* is a figure denoting "the death"; which is conceived as effecting a reconciliation between God and man and removing the burden of guilt. How this is done, is not explained; the author's general teaching is that salvation is mediated through the incarnate life of the Son; see ii. 2,

comment. The phrase *from all sin* cannot be taken in the widest sense, since v. 8 affirms the presence of sin in the believer; it does not mean "pre-Christian guilt"; it must refer to the lapses of the faithful; in some way the death of Christ abolishes the relation of guilt in which by means of transgression man stands to a holy God.

*If we say that we have no sin (v. 8).*—The verse is a rebuke of the Gnostic spiritual pride engendered by the teaching that the enlightened had received such gift from God that they needed neither exercise faith, nor obey the laws of morality, nor receive any forgiveness or pardon through Christ.

Verse 9 is the antithesis of v. 8; it states the ideal procedure of the humble man of faith: he confesses his sins; God forgives him because he is himself *faithful* to his promise to forgive (see Heb. x. 23); and *just*, since he cannot treat repentant and unrepentant alike.

Verse 10 repeats v. 8, with the additional thought that the denial of sin in ourselves makes God a *liar*, because God has called *all* men to repentance.

*We have an Advocate with the Father (ii. 1).*—The figure is forensic; the Father sits in heaven as judge; near him (Eph. i. 20; Heb. xii. 2) is the exalted *Jesus Christ* the righteous, who defends believers when the angels bring tidings of their sin. In the Gospel the *παράκλητος* is a helper on earth in place of Jesus (see John xiv. 16, comment); here the Paraclete is in heaven as a legal defender: he is specially characterised as righteous since only the righteous can successfully intercede for sinners. The figure, which represents God as not sufficiently inclined unto mercy, is below the usual level of Johannine theology; but is to be taken as figure rather than dogma.

*He is the propitiation (v. 2).*—The word *ἱλασμός* signifies "means of assuagement, reconciliation." By metonymy the



thing is here put for the person; Christ is the propitiator for our sins. Evidently the thought of Christ in heaven as Advocate suggested the other commonly accepted function of Christ in heaven, as presented by Paul (Rom. iii. 25) and emphasised by the author of Hebrews (ix. 11-14 and often), the function of serving as a sacrificial offering in the heavenly temple, whereby the sins of men may find atonement. This is the twofold function of the exalted Christ: he advocates the cause of the believers who fall into sin, he completes the sacrifice of himself begun on earth. These features are Pauline and Alexandrian.

The "whole world" denotes here, not the "whole world of believers" (Holtzmann, Augustine), but all mankind, because (a) of linguistic usage; the author would not designate believers by the word "κοσμος"; (b) the epistle is a general one, therefore the phrase *ours only* includes all Christians *ex hypothesi*. Thus the atoning work of Christ is put into relation with all men, the dualistic anthropology of Gnosticism is denied.

The true knowledge (Gnosis) is ethical, produces obedience to God and love to brethren, excludes love of the world, ii. 3-17.

*Hereby know we that we know him* (v. 3).—The double use of the verb "know" indicates a reference to the teaching of the "knowers," *i. e.*, the Gnostics, whose tendency was speculative and whose teaching was in many cases antinomian, that the possession of Gnosis freed one from the obligations of the moral law. Clem. Alex. (*Stromata*, iii., 1; v, 1) says of the Basilidians that they regarded themselves as free from the commandments and privileged to sin by virtue of the perfection of their "knowledge." This our author opposes. Absolute certainty of possession of the true Gnosis is found in obedience to the *commandments*, *i. e.*, the ethical precepts of the Old Testament and the word of Christ (John viii. 51); the especial command is love, iii. 23, which is proof of love to God, iv. 20, 21.

*I know him* (v. 4) is probably a favourite Gnostic assertion and boast; Titus i. 16. If the boaster is a libertine, he is also a liar; but perfect obedience is proof of perfect love (v. 5). In verse 6 there is also indirectly quoted another boastful assertion: *I abide in him*; i. e., in Christ the Æon.

*An old commandment*                      *a new commandment* (vv. 7, 8).—The *commandment* is the Apostolic preaching, the word which includes the words of Christ; since it is *from the beginning* of Christianity it is therefore, in antithesis to Gnostic innovations, old: since it is fresh, vital, operative as a present force, it is new. That this is the sense of the word new is shown by the remainder of the verse.

*He that saith he is in the light* (v. 9).—The reference is to spiritual boasters, probably especially to those who placed the emphasis upon enlightenment as an element in salvation. But true light is really love (see i. 5, 8; ii. 3, comment); therefore they who have no love have no light. The *brother* is here the Christian; the word *hateth* means "lacking in love." Verse 10 is the antithesis of the preceding, while verse 11 returns again to its thought that the conception may be more vivid; he who is in deep darkness is as helpless as if he had no visual organs; he gropes; he knows not whither he goes.

Verses 12-14 form a parenthetic insertion, which furnishes to the readers reasons for the composition of the epistle. The reference of the thrice-used *I have written* (or *I wrote*) is not clear: it may refer to the preceding verses, i. 1—ii. 11; or to some lost epistle; or to the fourth Gospel; or it may be that here the writer conceives himself for the moment carried forward to the time when the readers should receive the epistle and therefore writes as if it were finished; the last-named is most probable: the view that the reference is to the fourth Gospel is to be set aside because that Gospel has a distinctly doctrinal purpose plainly stated (John, Introduction, § 1).

*Love not the world (v. 15).*—The *world* denotes the great masses of humanity averted from ethical and spiritual good; see John i. 9, 10; iii. 16-17, comment. *The things that are in the world* are the lusts, passions, ambitions which determine the conduct of these multitudes.

Verse 16 contains the reason for the command of the preceding verse. *The lust of the flesh* is unchastity, gluttony; *the lust of the eyes* is the delight in immoral scenes, spectacles, plays; *the vainglory of life* is the pomp and display of wealth (for the word *βίος* probably means "possessions," "goods," as in iii. 17).

*And the world passeth away (v. 17).*—The verse contains an additional reason for the command of v 15: the transitoriness of the world and its lusts. The Parousia expectation appears elsewhere, see ii. 18, 28; iii. 2. But the Christian has life from Christ, a principle which enables him to survive physical death; see John v. 24; vi. 39, 40, 51, comment. While this is the form of the hope for the individual, for the living whole, the Church, this life will be completely conferred and actualised at the Parousia, to consideration of which the next section is devoted.

**The nearness of the Parousia; its signs; the demands which its nearness imposes upon the believer; ii. 18-iii. 8.**

*The last hour (v. 18).*—The phrase signifies the epoch or period immediately preceding the Parousia; see John i. 39, comment; *cf* for phrases of the same significance or sections of similar import, 2 Tim. iii. 1; Acts ii. 17; James v. 3; one indication of the last days, according to common tradition, was the appearance of Antichrist (as to this tradition see Rev. xi. 13, comment). Our author deviates from the current idea; Antichrist is neither the Jewish Satan nor the Roman power; the conception is dogmatic; the Antichrists are the heretical teachers, Cerinthus and other nameless Gnostics; see v. 22; iv. 3; 2 John 7.

*They went out from us (v. 19).*—The process of separation has begun, whether voluntary, as seems here more probable, or by excommunication: the test is dogmatic, it is a belief in Jesus as the Christ, the Son come in the flesh (v. 22; iv. 2, 3; 2 John 7). This separation because of disbelief has, however, its deep inner ground in a difference of nature: *they were not of us*.

*And ye have an anointing from the Holy One (v. 20).*—In the Greek the emphasis lies upon the word *ye*: the heretics have no anointing from God. The chief point of the verse lies in its relation to vv. 18, 19: the contrast between ἀντιχριστοὶ and χρίσμα, antichrists and chrisms. Since χρίστος (Christ) means “an anointed one,” and χρίσμα “an anointing” or “ointment,” the anti-Christ, the unanointed heretics, are here placed in sharpest antithesis to the believers, the orthodox, who have a real anointing. A second antithesis is left incomplete: the believers’ anointing is *from the Holy One*, God; the false anointing of the heretics, which is no true spiritual unction, is from the Unholy One (Belial the wicked, Satan, the father of lies); therefore the Gnostic heresies have their real ground in the absence of the Spirit, in the seductions of Satan. The text of the margin, which is that of the Sinaitic and Vatican codices, is preferable: *and ye all know*. All who truly believe are knowers, the Spirit is given to the whole Church: this is a reply to the assertion of Gnostics that the common believers had πίστις but not γνῶσις, faith but no knowledge. Therefore in v. 21 the assurance of this knowledge by all is given as a reason for writing to all.

*Who is the liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? (vv. 22-23).*—These deniers are not non-Christians in general, the vast masses of idol-worshippers, nor Jewish opponents who refused to accept Jesus as the Messiah prophesied in the Old Testament, but Gnostics who called themselves Christians but denied that the historical Jesus

was identical with the Æon Christ, opponents of the higher Christology; they who have no faith in this pre-existent, divine, yet truly incarnate *Son* do not have the Father, since Father and Son are so related; see John i. 14, 18, comment, and introduction to Gospel, §§ 1, 4; such deniers may have a certain belief in God, but knowledge of the Father comes through the Son.

*Let that abide in you which ye heard from the beginning* (v. 24).—This Gnostic denial of the Son (see v. 22 above) is a novelty; the readers are exhorted to abide in the earlier word which they had heard *from the beginning* of their Christian life (see v. 7; i. 2, comment).

The seducers of v. 26 are the false teachers of vv. 18-23.

The *anointing* (v. 27) is the same as that of v. 20; the thought of vv. 20, 21 is repeated, with the addition of the idea of permanence in the gift of the Spirit (John xiv. 16).

*If he shall be manifested* (v. 28).—The subject is not God (Weiss), but Christ, because: (a) nowhere in the New Testament, not even in 1 Tim. iii. 16, is God the subject of the verb *φανερόω* when it is passive; (b) the verb is used often in the New Testament to designate the expected Parousia, see Col. iii. 4; 1 Peter v. 4; or the earthly life of Christ, John i. 31; Heb. ix. 26; 1 John i. 2; or, especially, post-resurrection appearances, John xxi. 14; (c) the word Parousia in this verse has its usual New Testament signification of the expected speedy return of Christ from heaven. The contingency of the expression indicates a doubt of the *visible* appearance of Christ; the author is certain that the end is near (v. 18), but, as in the Gospel, the doctrine of the presence of Christ as Spirit and Comforter has modified the Parousia hope.

*Now are we the children of God* (iii. 2).—The emphasis lies upon *now*: the present good of being *children of God* is put over against a greater good to be realised at the Parousia; the incomplete condition and vision of childhood will

then be succeeded by a higher state of being which will come with the vision of the manifested Son of God; to see him as he is will change the beholder into a nearer likeness to him. Both phrases: *it is not made manifest what we shall be*, and *if he shall be manifested*, indicate the already mentioned (ii. 28) doubt as to the visible appearance of Christ when the end shall come.

The hope of the end, the Parousia, becomes an impulse to self-purification, since he (ἐνεῖνος, Christ, as in ii. 24, see comment) *is pure*.

*Every one that doeth sin doeth also lawlessness (v. 4).*—To this purity of life among believers, grounded on the hope as to the blessed future, is now set in sharp antithesis the Gnostic Antinomianism, the self-will which is the opposite of that surrender to the divine will which forms the essence of the kingdom of God. Individual sin is no matter purely personal, it is infraction of law and defiance of a lawgiver: *sin is lawlessness*.

This aspect of sin is visible in the following verse (5). Since sin is infraction of law, the lawgiver is involved in the issue; but he in his mercy has caused the sinless Christ to be *manifested to take away sins*: see ii. 2; John i. 29. The last clause of the verse is the negative form of ii. 29 and iii. 3.

*Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not (v. 6).*—The antithesis of the verse furnishes the explanation of this first clause. The two moral habitudes: abiding in Christ and continuing in sin, are sharply contrasted. Therefore the phrase *sinneth not* cannot be regarded, as Weiss maintains, as absolute; since the readers abide in God and Christ (iii. 24; iv. 13) yet are not without sin (i. 10; ii. 1); the true believers, abiding in God, are free from the habitual domination of sin as a ruling principle: the phrase *whosoever sinneth* must also be understood as meaning habitual or constant sin, otherwise both the writer and his readers (i. 8, 10)

are excluded from those who have seen or known Christ.

Of love as the test and ground of our sonship of God and of our certain salvation; iii. 7-24.

The misconceptions of sin and righteousness, current by reason of Gnostic influences, demand the laying down of some practical test: such an one is efficient love.

*He that doeth righteousness is righteous* (v. 7).—The emphasis lies upon the word *doeth*; all assertion and assumption, unsupported by conduct, are vain; the righteousness of Christ was shown by his activities in our behalf.

*He that doeth sin is of the devil* (v. 8).—The verse is the antithesis of the preceding, but the author turns aside to indicate the unseen ground of the evil conduct; it does not lie in any temporary cause or condition such as the fluctuating movements of the sinner's will, but in permanent activities far deeper; *for the devil sinneth from the beginning*. See John viii. 44, comment.

*Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin* (v. 9).—The sinner is spiritually begotten from Satan; the God-begotten work righteousness; the reason is that God's seed, the fructifying power of the Spirit, abides in them; but the statements in this verse must be taken with the same limitations as those of v. 6. Schmiedel regards *seed* as here used in the Gnostic sense of "individual seed-grains of divine origin scattered through the world of matter."

The following section, vv. 11-18, is entirely in the spirit of the farewell discourses, John xiii-xvii.

*For this is the message which ye heard from the beginning* (v. 11).—The *beginning* is, as in ii. 7, the commencement of their Christian life. The thought is in repetition of ii. 9-11, and is illustrated by contrast in the following verse (12); Cain is chosen as a type because between brothers such an issue as murder seems most unnatural and can find its

explanation only in the spiritual derivation of Cain and Abel; one was of Satan, the other of God, therefore the difference of their works and the jealousy and hatred of Cain. As wrong and monstrous would be hatred between spiritual brothers, the Christians.

*Marvel not, brethren, if the world hateth you (v. 13).*—If between brothers like Cain and Abel hate arose, it should be no wonder if the world (νόσμος with the sense of ii. 15, see comment) should seethe with jealous hatred, on the contrary love of the brethren is a sure Christian test (v. 14), only the loving have life; and between Christians hatred is a sin as grievous as murder (see Matt. v. 21, 22) and proves the absence of eternal life (v. 15). The addition of the participle *abiding* indicates how largely the thought of *continuity* has been dropped from the word *eternal*, and been replaced by the element of *quality*; the life is spiritual.

*He laid down his life for us (v. 16).*—The subject is Christ (ἐκεῖνος as ii. 25, see comment); his death *for*, not *instead of*, *us* is the proof and consummation of love (John xv 13): the Christian should strive to attain this height. The addition of the words *for the brethren* indicates the peculiar quality of the Johannine teaching as to love; it is the basis and impulse of self-sacrifice within the Church; while the thought of love for non-Christians is not entirely absent, it rarely finds expression; there is deep, tender love for the chosen; for the hostile world averted from God and true life there is usually aversion and scorn.

In vv. 19-24 the possession of sincere and fruitful brotherly love is presented as the comforting assurance of personal acceptance with God.

*Hereby (v. 19), i. e., by the display of this genuine, efficient love.*

*We shall assure our hearts before him; we shall persuade our hearts, which are uneasy in their sense of defect and*



failure, and thus give them assurance, set them at rest. The persuasion leads to assurance. The phrase *before him* refers to God; he is present by his Spirit, and since he *knoweth all things*, recognises and values our genuine, fruitful love (v. 20).

Verse 21 returns in substance to the thought of v. 19; there is added in v. 22 the assurance of granted prayer (as Mk. xi. 23, 24; Matt. xxi. 22; John xvi. 24), on the ground of obedience and service.

*And this is his commandment*, etc. (v. 23).—The doing of the will of God includes faith as well as obedience because the brother-love is founded on the exemplary love of Christ the Son of God; one must therefore believe in him, accept him as Son and receive his love; therefore the commandment includes both faith and love. Out of this doing flows as result mutual union, indwelling of the believer and God: the presence of the Spirit was, in the Apostolic Church, a proof of the actualisation of salvation (v. 24).

**A confession of Jesus as the Son of God in the flesh is the test of the presence of the true spirit; iv. 1-6.**

The mention of the bestowed spirit (iii. 24) leads to the thought that the heretics claim the presence of the spirit; and that there must be some decisive test by which the true spirits can be discriminated from the false; such a test is in the anti-Docetic confession: Jesus Christ came truly in the flesh. The opponents are those of ii. 18-26.

*Beloved, believe not every spirit* (iv. 1).—Since the spirit manifests itself in the personality, the exhortation is a request to weigh the utterances of those who assert for themselves the possession of the spirit; of such the foremost are the prophets, the inspired preachers of the early Church (see Matt. vii. 15; 1 Cor. xiv. 29, 32; 2 Peter ii. 1). Only those who proclaim the true humanity of Jesus are genuine; the Docetic prophets are false (v. 2). The positive form is now

characteristically followed by the negative (*v.* 3); the denier of the genuine humanity is declared to be possessed, not of the spirit of God, but of Antichrist (see ii. 18, comment).

In *vv.* 4-6 lie many antitheses: *ye* (the true believers) and *they* (the false prophets, the Gnostics); *ye are of God*, they are *of the world*; he that is in you is *God*, he that is in them is *Satan* (see John xii. 31; xiv. 30; xvi. 11.); the world heareth Satan and his prophets, the believers hear God and the true prophets; hereby the spirits are discerned.

The source and nature of the love demanded; iv. 7-11.

The author returns to his fundamental and favourite theme; the divergence began at iii. 19.

*For love is of God* (*v.* 7).—This is the sublime reason for the command; thereby we enter the realm of the divine, since we are born of God and become his spiritual children; see John i. 13; iii. 3-8, comment. Though the verb in the phrase: *every one that loveth*, has no expressed object, the word brethren must be implied; love of brethren is not here presented as the *cause* of the Christian's birth from, and knowledge of, God; it is *test* and *proof*.

The thought is now stated negatively (*v.* 8), with the added reason: *for God is love*. The word *love* here is not to be taken too abstractly, as attribute; it signifies active *moral energy*, manifested in beneficence. Since this is God's nature, he who is not beneficent has not God, knows him not.

In *vv.* 9, 10 the proof and illustration of this active beneficent energy is given: the sending of the only-begotten Son into the world for the salvation of men.

On the *propitiation* see ii. 2, comment.

This Christian love is ground and test of sonship; iv. 12-21.

This section is in the main a repetition of iii. 7-24; the meditation contains few new ideas; dwelling in God, love

as test, the confession of Jesus the Son of God, love as ground of confidence, love to God as absent without brother-love—all these have appeared in preceding sections; only the new features interspersed demand notice.

*No man hath beheld God at any time (v. 12).*—This is a duplicate of John i. 18; but the connection differs.

Since God withdraws himself from sense, his presence is spiritual; as love is his nature, he is present in those who love, he realises in them his inmost nature.

The presence of the Spirit is presented (as iii. 24, see comment) as proof of the indwelling of God (v. 13); the Spirit makes known to us the truth.

*And we have beheld and bear witness (v. 14).*—The subject is not the writer only (and therefore the verse is not a proof that he was an eye-witness, as Weiss maintains), but the Church, the true believers; this is proven both by the context and by the object of the two verbs; (a) because the Spirit dwells in the believers (v. 13) and has led them into all truth (John xvi. 13, 14) they have beheld the grandeur of the Son's mission; (b) that which they have beheld and testify is no external happening, is not the visible Jesus, but a spiritual truth, *i. e.*, *that the Father hath sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world* (see i. 1, 2, comment); (c) the verse thereby comes into close relationship with both the preceding and following verses, since the order of thought is as follows: the Spirit abides in believers (v. 13); enlightens them as to the true nature and relations of the Father and his Son the world-saviour; this testimony is completed and realised in the confession before the world that *Jesus is the Son of God* (v. 15). As to the meaning of the phrase: Son of God, see John i. 18, 34, comment.

*Herein is our love made perfect (v. 17).*—This love is not only adequate to supplying a present sense of repose in God, it assures the future; through it we may have confidence when the day of judgment (see ii. 28, comment) arrives.

The ground of this confidence is that as believers and confessors of Christ we come into the same fundamental union with God as the risen Christ enjoys, because as *he* (ἐκεῖνος is Christ as iii. 5, 7, 16) *is* in his heavenly glory, *so*, in respect to our union with God, *are we*, though we still abide *in this world*.

See John xiv. 20; xvii. 21, comment.

*There is no fear in love* (v. 18).—While the proposition is universal in form, its validity is to be demonstrated from the context. The love is not here human love, though even here the proposition is relatively true, but love between man and God, where, in view of the perfection of God, the object of man's love, perfect love may ensue, a complete union arise, in which there is no fear, but only joyful confidence even in view of coming judgment.

Verse 19 repeats the thought of v. 10 (see comment on same), and verse 20 sets forth the true inclusiveness of this love; it is not a matter of God and the individual soul alone, it includes the brethren: the Gnostic boast (ii. 4, 9, 10) is idle if true practical service of one another is absent; if hate is present the boast of love to God becomes a lie.

The power and witness of faith; v. 1-12.

*Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God* (v. 1).—Faith in the divine nature and human reality of Jesus over against Gnostic and other heresies (see introduction to Epistle and i. 1; ii. 4, 22; iv. 2, comment) is here presented as *proof* of birth from God; this faith is here neither considered as *cause* or *result* of heavenly birth. This birth, which produces love of the begetter, God, whose spiritual children we become, produces also love of the begotten, the brethren. Therefore in verse 2, the reverse of iv. 20, 21 is stated: from a true love of God, which includes a doing of his will, genuine love of brethren must be inferred; both belong together, though the heretics may attempt their separation (see ii. 9, comment).

This love of God is practical, not speculative and individualistic (v. 3); and the keeping of the commandments is not oppressive and liable to issue in failure and defeat; *for whosoever is begotten of God overcometh the world* (v. 4), the moral enemy of the militant believer. The God-begotten element in the believer's life appears as *faith*, which has already won its victory, *hath overcome the world*. The instrument, faith, is here put by metonymy in place of the victor who wields it. This faith, the instrument of victory, assumes the form of a belief (and confession, iv. 15) that Jesus is the Son of God (v. 5). The phrase Son of God has here its usual Johannine sense; see iv. 2; John i. 18; introduction to Gospel of John, § 2.

*This is he that came by water and by blood* (v. 6).—The witness to this true object of faith, Jesus Christ, is now presented; the Gospel of John abounds in passages where the different witnesses are produced (i. 45; v. 31-45; viii. 14-18; xv. 26; xvi. 14; especially xix. 34, 35). The Gnostic opposition to the truly human Jesus constantly echoes in the writer's mind; his witness is here a refutation of their heresy; therefore the explicit mention of Christ as Jesus. The word "*came*" does not refer to the descent from heaven, but to the historical manifestation; the preposition "*by*" (*διὰ*) does not mean "by means of" but in a sense partly local, partly temporal, it signifies "through," as when we say, "He came by Jericho to Jerusalem"; the words "*water*" and "*blood*" signify the baptism by John and the crucifixion, the two termini of the public ministry of Jesus. Therefore the meaning is: as this Jesus Christ, truly human and truly Son of God, was such before the baptism, remained such during and after the crucifixion; he actually, as Jesus and as Son, came through both these experiences; his baptism was no mockery, his crucifixion no farce, his resurrection appearances no phantasm. This is the refutation of the Docetic Gnosticism which separated the fleshly Jesus from the heavenly

Christ, asserting that the æon Christ became temporarily united with the unreal Jesus at the baptism and left him before the crucifixion (see John xix. 34, 35, comment; introduction to John, § 4). That the author desires to include also the Christian sacraments of baptism and the eucharist in the words *water* and *blood* is shown: (a) by the following phrase: *and not with (in) water only*, etc.; (b) by the succeeding verse (v. 7), where the Spirit, which in the Church is given by baptism, and continued and intensified by the eucharist, is set forth as the true and abiding witness; (c) by the analogy of the use of the same words in John iii. 5 and vi. 53-56, see comment.

The Revised Version omits the words which in the King James Version form a part of the seventh and eighth verses, as follows: *in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth.* This is the most famous of all the N.T. interpolations; its origin was in the West, apparently about 400 A.D.; it gradually made its way into Latin versions, but appears in no Greek text until the fifteenth century. Its presence in the Vulgate caused such embarrassment to Catholic scholars, that in the year 1897 the Holy Office declared that its authenticity could not "safely" be called in question, a decision, says Abbé Fouard (*St. John*, p. 209), "which commands our entire respect, and to which we must needs submit."

*For there are three who bear witness (v. 8).*—The proof that the Spirit is the truth lies in the witness, which is threefold, as demanded in law and custom (Deut. xvii. 6; xix. 15; 2 Cor. xiii. 1): *Spirit, water, blood*; the water and the blood are here baptism and the eucharist; they can be only externally separated, since it is the presence of the Spirit in the rites which gives them the power to testify of the true Sonship of Jesus Christ; therefore *the three agree in one*, they bear the same testimony.

Verse 9 presents the argument from the less to the greater: if we receive human witness, surely we must accept the divine witness given in vv. 6-8; the anointing giveth know-

ledge, ii. 20; the true confession is proof of the indwelling of God, iv. 2, 13; therefore (v. 10) there is an inner witness due to the presence of God in the soul, unbelief in that witness makes God *a liar*; see also John iii. 18, 33.

As to *eternal life* (v. 11) see John i. 4; iii. 15, comment.

**Conclusion, vv. 13-21.**

With the thought of the eternal life in the Son the author reverts to the initial conception (i. 1-3). The conclusion presents the true Gnosis of the believer: he knows that he has eternal life (v. 13); that his prayers are heard (vv. 14-17); that he is victorious over sin (v. 18); that he is of God (v. 19); that the Son has come and given him power to know the realities of salvation (v. 20). Most of these thoughts have been previously expressed.

Verse 13 contains the general purpose of the epistle; compare John xx. 30, 31.

*The boldness* (v. 14) is the confidence (as ii. 28), the openness born of consciousness of union with God, which leads to large but trustful petition to him in assurance of a hearing which is not simply a listening to but also a granting the requests (v. 15). This is an immediate spiritual result; we have the answer actually given to our faith; for the external fulfilment we wait with confidence.

One sin among the brotherhood is so heinous that forgiveness for it must not be sought from God by fellow-Christians: *the sin unto death* (vv. 16, 17).

Concerning this obscure passage, it may be noted: (a) that the sin was to be committed within the Church, if at all; (b) that the use of the word *μὴ* in the expression *a sin not unto death* shows that the believer who saw his brother sin was left to his own judgment to decide whether it was a sin *not unto death* or *unto death*, and therefore that there was no external criterion, no accepted standard; the sin was not defined; (c) that the participle *ἀμαρτάνοντα* shows that both sins in question were not single acts but habits or repeated activities; (d) that the writer does not *forbid* prayer for such a sin

(or sinner): he does not say "I say that concerning this sin of his brother the believer should not make request," but exempts it from the sins concerning which prayer for a brother is *obligatory*; (e) that non-forgiveness by God is not asserted, but it is implied that the sin is so grievous that the believer may not be sure that in making petition concerning it he asks according to the will of God; (f) that the two classes of sins were probably those known among the Rabbis as trivial and mortal, *i. e.*, usually punishable by death; (g) that bodily death, as the result of sinful habits, is not here meant; (h) that *αἰτῆσαι* is probably mandatory: *he shall ask* or *let him ask*, not simple future: *he will ask*; (i) that the word *God* is inserted into the translation, and while it may be the proper subject one may also choose the marginal rendering: *he shall ask and shall give him life*, in which case the suppliant for his brother is also the giver of life to him, and therefore the word *δώσει* is also mandatory: *let him give life*, and the life in question is something within the power of the Church to grant, such as succour, aid, forgiveness, spiritual quickening; (j) that if this last rendering be accepted and the life is something given by the Church, its opposite, death, may also be within the Church's power, and thus the explanation of many Fathers, that excommunication is here meant, becomes worthy of notice; (k) that *θανάτος*, *death* (rarely used in the Johannine writings save in a literal sense), when employed figuratively in this epistle (and in John v. 24) denotes no final condition, but a past or present spiritual torpor open to remedy, see iii. 14; (l) that John iii. 36 is not a parallel passage, since there the person in question is an unbeliever, here a disciple going wrong.

Verses 18, 19, repeat in substance the thought of iii. 6, 9; iv 4, 6; see comment. The marginal word *himself* is more probable; as to *the evil one*, see ii. 13, 14. The antithesis is of the sharpest; on the one side the Church under the sway of the indwelling Spirit of God, on the other the vast masses of the idolatrous Gentiles, blinded and vice-corroded under the sway of the evil one—such was the aspect in these early decades of the second century. In this fearful situation the refuge of the Christian is in the true Gnosis, the saving knowledge; for we know *that the Son of God is come (v. 20)*, has given a knowledge of *him that is true*, and *eternal life*



in *his Son*. That the word *this* in the clause: *This is the true God*, refers to Deity, not to Christ, is probable: (a) because the word  $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$  with the article designates Deity in John i. 1, 18; (b) because this completes the threefold designation of God as true, as we have the threefold "*we know*" in vv. 18, 19, 20; (c) because of the antithesis with the idols of the next verse; this may have been suggested by 1 Thess. i. 9; or be a common phrase in that age.

The *idols* of v. 21 are not visible images, but erroneous and shifting fancies and speculations, especially Gnostic opinions.

# THE SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF JOHN.

---

## INTRODUCTION

1. These two letters are first noticed by writers at the end of the second century and the beginning of the third. Clement and the Muratorian Canon do not mention Third John; both epistles are absent from the earliest Syrian New Testament; they are unmentioned by early Western writers; Origen knows of them, but is uncertain as to their canonicity; Eusebius, in the fourth century, places them among the disputed writings. This lateness of circulation may be in part due to their brevity and want of fitness for use in worship. They have the characteristics of letters; address, name of author, greeting, conclusion, local and individual features. Both purport to be written by "the elder." It is probable that either they come from the pen of the elder of Ephesus, John the Presbyter, or are written by some one in his name; that an Apostle should so designate himself, should refuse to use his apostolic authority in giving instructions, should find himself so opposed and defied as the author by Diotrephes (3 John 9, 10), is highly improbable. They have common features; the dependence of both upon First John is evident; both are concerned with matters which were practical and urgent in the first half of the second century.

2. The object of Second John is to protect the Church from the Gnostic heretical teachers who, after the manner of

Christian prophets and missionaries, journeyed from town to town. Such are to be denied the usual privileges of teachers: reception into the houses of believers on arrival, with "god-speed" and gifts at departure. The letter is addressed "to the elect lady and her children" by which phrase the writer means some church with its members, as the exegesis will show.

3. The third epistle has as its main purpose the securing of a more favourable reception for the wandering prophets and heralds and the continuance of their influence in the local churches in the face of tendencies toward territorial episcopal government. Whether Diotrephes is, as Harnack supposes, an official, a monarchical bishop, or simply a man of personal force and hostile temper, is not entirely clear; but at any rate the document is a valuable witness of the decline of the earlier enthusiasm and the growth of local authority.

4. Since both letters end with the outlook upon a speedy visit, and the persons addressed in the third epistle can hardly have been members of the church to which the second was written, it is probable that "*the elder*" was, or was held in tradition to be, a wandering teacher or apostle, held in some authority in the region of his activity; the era of monarchical episcopal authority had not come, but was at hand.

# THE SECOND EPISTLE OF JOHN.

---

## COMMENTARY.

*THE elder* (v. 1).—The word may mean simply an aged person, or a church official; since the definite article here precedes it, the probability is that some particular person had come to bear this common appellation: *the* elder. On John the elder, see introduction to the Gospel of John, § 7.

Because of v. 12 and 3 John 12, 13 it is a fair inference that this elder was, or was represented to be, a travelling missionary, a Christian prophet or apostle in the wider sense.

The *elect lady* is some church, probably in Asia Minor; *her children* are the members; it is possible that the expression is only representative and that the letter was written to the whole Church, but v. 13 favours the former interpretation, as it also shows that *the elect lady* is not an individual. The author is a true Gnostic; the knowledge of *the* (Christian) *truth* (of brotherhood) becomes the cause and motive of the love. This truth *abides* (v. 2), while the false Gnostics have only shifting fancies. The salutation of v. 3 resembles the Pastoral epistles (1 Tim. i. 2; 2 Tim. i. 2): the Johannine word *Son* is used instead of Lord, the Spirit is not mentioned; the Trinitarian formula has not become custom. The request of vv. 4–7 concerns the love and conduct of the Church in the face of the growing heretical Gnosticism; the situation is similar to that depicted in the first epistle, where nearly all the phrases of this section appear; in explanation

of *the new commandment* and *the beginning* see comment on 1 John ii. 7, 8, 24; iii. 23; as to the *deceivers* who deny that *Jesus Christ is come in the flesh* see comment on 1 John ii. 18, 26; iv. 1-3.

The warning of vv. 8-11 contains the chief purpose of the epistle, see Introduction, § 2. He who *goeth onward* and *abideth not in the teaching of Christ* is the restless Gnostic, who has left the doctrine of Messiah the Son and so lost also the other; his deity is a metaphysical abstraction. From such schismatics the hospitality which was a solemn obligation in the early churches (Rom. xii. 13; 1 Tim, iii. 2; Heb. xiii. 2) must be withdrawn; the second century, which found precautionary measures necessary, attributed them even to the Apostles (*Teaching of the XII Apostles*, xiii., 2); in this epistle a doctrinal test of hospitality and fellowship is established; the situation is serious.

As to the implications of the conclusion (vv. 12, 13) see comment on v. 1, and Introduction, § 4.

# THE THIRD EPISTLE OF JOHN.

---

## COMMENTARY.

*THE elder* (v. 1): see comment on 2 John 1. The *Gaius* (for disciples so named at Corinth and Pergamon see 1 Cor. i. 14, *Apostolic Const.* vii. 46) is not further described; whether actual layman, official, or ideal representative, cannot be determined; in the latter case the letter is really intended for the whole Church; it is difficult to conceive how such advice could be deemed pertinent and important for a single layman.

*All things* (v. 2): all which relates to the physical and earthly welfare; the prayer is that temporal prosperity may keep pace with the spiritual, of which latter the writer has been informed by visiting disciples.

In vv. 5-8 is included the chief purpose of the letter: to secure a favourable and hearty reception for the travelling prophets or missionaries who come from distant regions (perhaps the temporary residence of the writer) to the church of Gaius; see Introduction; for reverse, 2 John 9-11. Some of these, *brethren and strangers*, have returned to the writer, and borne testimony to Gaius' love; when they come again they are to be received hospitably and *set forward on their journey worthily*, i. e., with good-wishes and gifts, in the same spirit of sacrifice as they manifest who, *taking nothing* from *the Gentiles* from whom they came forth, and therefore impecunious, wander homeless *for the sake of the Name*; see Acts v. 41, comment.

To Gaius the antithesis is found in Diotrephes, *vv. 9-10*. The author had written *somewhat* on this matter *to the church*; that this previous letter, the contents of which Diotrephes had defied, was our second epistle, is not to be held, because that letter dealt with the reverse of the third, the rejection of heretical apostles. The word *us* in v. 9 warrants the inference that the writer was among the peripatetic prophets or apostles of the time. Harnack believes Diotrephes to have been a (sole) bishop of this church, who used his official power to exclude such workers and even excommunicate those who favoured the early custom of peripatetic prophecy. The letter does not affirm this, but favours it, and certainly indicates that the opponents of the older custom (headed by Diotrephes) were numerous enough to cast out its adherents; the situation here also is serious, but the writer believes himself influential enough, should he come, to reverse the situation.

The witness of Demetrius (*v. 12*), who is probably a member of the church, is valuable; but the witness of the elder wandering prophets (for the *we also* of v. 12 refers to the same persons as the *us* of v. 9, in contrast with the writer, the *I* of vv. 2, 4, 9, 14) is more valuable: *thou knowest*, probably through the witness of the Spirit, *that our witness is true*. See John xix. 34, 35; xxi. 24.

As to *vv. 13, 14*, see 2 John 12, 13, comment. Meanwhile the Christians are to feed and be fed with the sincere salutations of absent but loving friends.

# INDEX TO THE FOUR VOLUMES OF THE SERIES OF INTERNATIONAL HANDBOOKS TO THE NEW TESTAMENT

The Roman numerals refer to the volumes, as indicated by the number of stars upon the back of each; the Arabic numerals to the pages.

- Abbott, E. A., on silence of Papias, III., 367; on Justin, III., 372; on the Diatessaron, III., 379.
- Acts, book of, IV., 1-11.; contents, IV., 1.; authorship and time, IV., 2; sources, IV., 4; historicity, IV., 9; text, IV., 10.
- Adam, II., 127; Christ and, II., 292; III., 210.
- Agrippa II., IV., 78.
- Aion (age), I., 150.
- Ananias, IV., 26.
- Ananias the Damascene, IV., 36.
- Angels, I., 27; judged by Christians, II., 83, 104; law given by, II., 222; III., 14, 16, 180, 227; fallen, III., 334, 349; IV., 27; seven, IV., 103; of abyss, IV., 118.
- Anna, I., 41.
- Annas, I., 46, 54; sons of, IV., 24, 313.
- Antichrist, II., 38.
- Antipas, I., 18, 46, 191, 307, 355.
- Apocalypse; see Revelation.
- Apostles, Twelve, I., 93, 94; Scripture in age of, III., 356.
- Apostolic Constitutions, I., 81.
- Aratus quoted, IV., 61.
- Archelaus, I., 18, 355.
- Areopagus, IV., 60.
- Ascension, III., 158; IV., 14. (See also Jesus.)
- Assumption of Moses, III., 350.
- Athenagoras, III., 381.
- Babylon as Rome, III., 323; IV., 138.
- Balaam, teaching of, IV., 107.
- Barabbas, I., 308.
- Barnabas, II., 97; IV., 26; epistle of, III., 362.
- Basilides, III., 374.
- Baur, on 2 Thess., II., 7.
- Beast, the apocalyptic, IV., 121, 124, 127, 128, 137.
- Beatitudes, I., 95-102.
- Beelzebub, I., 147.
- Bethany, I., 293; IV., 275.
- Bethlehem, birth of Jesus at, I., 13, 37, 39.
- Bishops, II., 363; in Pastoral Epistles, III., 211, 254; from Ephesus, IV., 68.
- Blind, healed by Jesus, I., 213, 247; IV., 257; healed by Vespasian, I., 213.
- Blood, III., 53; of Christ, II., 282, 291; III., 48, 60; IV., 344; water and, IV., 327, 358.
- Bousset on birth of Messiah in Revelation, IV., 126.
- Bowls, the seven, IV., 134.



- Candace, IV., 35.  
 Canon, see New Testament.  
 Canonicity, meaning of, III., 354.  
 Christ as rock, II., 99.  
 Christ, see Jesus.  
 Christology, of Paul, II., 127, 164, 227, 253, 307, 317, 370-377; of Hebrews, III., 12, 13, 14, 15, 21, 28, 31, 43, 79; of Colossians, III., 94, 95, 97, 99; of Ephesians, III., 128, 136, 140, 142, 178; of Pastorals, III., 265, 308; IV., 20; of Fourth Gospel and First Epistle of John, IV., 151-154, 177, 178, 183, 185, 221, 236, 249, 256, 266, 296.  
 Churches, letters to the seven, IV., 104.  
 Cicero, I., 106, 107.  
 Clement, of Rome, III., 361; of Alexandria, III., 390.  
 Clementine Homilies, III., 373.  
 Codices of New Testament, I., 336.  
 Collection for poor in Jerusalem, II., 52, 129, 163, 350.  
 Colossæ, III., 85.  
 Colossians, III., 85; object of, III., 86; time and author of, III., 89.  
 Comforter, see Paraclete.  
 Corinth, party dissensions at, II., 45, 62.  
 Corinthians, First Epistle to, II., 43; occasion of, II., 43; analysis, II., 55; Second Epistle to, II., 48; analysis, II., 133.  
 Cornelius, IV., 41.  
 Council of Trent, III., 393.  
 Criticism and canon, III., 394.  
 Cyril of Jerusalem, III., 391.  
 Damascus, IV., 36.  
 Deacons, appointment of seven, IV., 29.  
 Dead raised, I., 173, 175; IV., 267, 272.  
 Demoniacs, I., 68, 69, 89, 92, 359.  
 Demons, III., 174.  
 De Quincey, I., 72.  
 Diana, IV., 65.  
 Dionysius; the Little, I., 36; of Corinth, III., 380; the Areopagite, IV., 61.  
 Divorce, Jesus on, I., 106.  
 Dove, I., 60.  
 Dragon (see also Beast), IV., 124, 125.  
 Drummond on traits of remote tradition, IV., 155.  
 Ecstasy, see Vision.  
 Elders, the heavenly, IV., 110.  
 Election, Pauline doctrine of, II., 321-328.  
 Elizabeth, I., 23, 31.  
 Enoch, book of, quoted, III., 351.  
 Ephesians, Epistle to, III., 123-131; address to, III., 124; authorship of Epistle, III., 126, 131.  
 Ephesus, III., 123; IV., 62; temple at, IV., 65.  
 Erasmus, I., 347.  
 Eschatology (see Parousia), I., 278, 280, 282, 287, 290; II., 123, 124, 154, 340; III., 84.  
 Essenes, I., 356.  
 Eucharist, in Corinth, II., 104, 106; in Fourth Gospel, IV., 237, 238.  
 Eusebius on canon, III., 391.  
 Evangelists, III., 248.  
 Faith, in Pauline writings, II., 222, 223, 275; justification by, II., 224, 283, 291; in Hebrews, III., 65, 82; in James, III., 281.  
 Fasting, I., 120.  
 Feeding of the multitudes, I., 198, 210; IV., 226-229.  
 Felix, IV., 75.  
 Fig-tree, blasted, I., 251, 255; parable of, I., 251.

- Fish, explanation of coin in mouth of, I., 224; of number caught, IV., 336.  
 Foreordination, II., 68, 314.  
 Fornication in Corinth, II., 85.  
 Fritzsche on grace, II., 199.
- Galatians, Epistle to, II., 189; analysis of, II., 193.  
 Gallio, IV., 62.  
 Gate, narrow, I., 132.  
 Genealogies of Jesus, I., 1.  
 Gnostics, described, III., 243, 333, 348; combated in Fourth Gospel, IV., 159, 185; in Johannine Epistles, IV., 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 349, 357.  
 God, elasticity of term, IV., 179.  
 Gog, IV., 144.  
 Golden Rule, I., 131.  
 Golgotha, I., 310; IV., 323.  
 Grace, dissertation on, II., 196, 338.  
 Greek, character of New Testament, I., 41.  
 Grotius on canon, III., 394.  
 Gunkel on vision of birth of Messiah, IV., 126.
- Hades, meaning of, I., 184.  
 Hagar as Mount Sinai, II., 232.  
 Heathen world, corruption of, II., 266.  
 Heaven, ancient idea of, I., 58.  
 Hebrews, Epistle to, III., 1-9; canonicity of, III., 3; authorship of, III., 5; time of, III., 6; Christology of, III., 12, 20, 21, 28, 31, 43.  
 Hegesippus, III., 368.  
 Hermas, shepherd of, III., 363.  
 Herod, the family of, I., 355; the Great, I., 356.  
 Herodias, I., 193, 356.  
 High-priesthood, in Hebrews, III., 42; in Philo, III., 44.  
 Hilgenfeld on Justin, III., 371.  
 Hillel, I., 131.
- Holy Spirit, I., 29; II., 69, 108, 187, 310; III., 108, 164, IV., 247.  
 Honey, wild, I., 50.
- Irenæus on Fourth Gospel, III., 384; IV., 159.
- James the Apostle, III., 267.  
 James the brother of Jesus, III., 267.  
 James, Epistle of, III., 267; object of, III., 268; relation to Pauline doctrine, III., 270; authorship, III., 271.  
 Jerusalem, council at, II., 206; IV., 50-53; chastisement of, IV., 122; the New, IV., 146.  
 Jesus, meaning of name, I., 4, 7; genealogies of, I., 1; family of, I., 155; birth of, at Bethlehem, I., 1, 5, 10, 13, 37; IV., 234; date of birth of, I., 36; circumcision of, I., 40; carried into Egypt, I., 15-17; remains in temple, I., 42; baptism of, I., 57; temptation of, I., 60; as healer, I., 76, 78, 80, 91, 173, 175, 213, 222; IV., 257; his attitude toward the law, I., 103; feeds the multitudes, I., 198, 210; IV., 226; walks upon the lake, I., 201; IV., 228; transfiguration of, I., 219; at Bethany, I., 293; IV., 275; cleanses temple, I., 253; IV., 197, 199, 282; at Gethsemane, I., 300; his trial before the Sanhedrin, I., 303; IV., 322; before Pilate, I., 307; IV., 316; his crucifixion, I., 312; IV., 322; time and manner of his death, I., 313, 314; IV., 322-326; miracles at his death, I., 315; his entombment, I., 316; IV., 328; watch at his tomb, I., 317, 319; his tomb found empty, I., 317; IV., 329, 330; accompanies disciples to Emmaus, I., 326; is seen at Jerusalem, I., 321;

*Jesus—Continued*

- appears in Galilee, I., 322; IV., 334; his ascension, I., 323; IV., 14; his resurrection, according to Paul, II., 119;—In the Fourth Gospel he is depicted as prophet, IV., 151; as priest, IV., 152, as king, IV., 153; turns water into wine, IV., 193, 196; converses with Nicodemus, IV., 199, 205; raises Lazarus, IV., 267; is sought by Greeks, IV., 270; washes disciples' feet, IV., 284; his side is pierced, IV., 326; is set forth as pre-existent, IV., 177, 179, 253, 254, 256; as door, IV., 261; as light of the world, IV., 260; as shepherd, IV., 263; his farewell discourses, IV., 309–311.
- John, Apostle, in tradition, II., 206; IV., 166.
- John, Gospel of, introduction to, IV., 151; purpose of, IV., 151; synopsis of, IV., 151; its relation to Synoptics, IV., 154–157; relation to Jews, IV., 157; composite, IV., 161; time of, IV., 164; prologue of, IV., 177; appendix, IV., 334, 338.
- John the Baptist, birth of, I., 23, 27; 31, 33; 45, 57, 140, 142; imprisonment of, I., 192; late disciples of, IV., 64; in Fourth Gospel, IV., 158, 181, 205.
- John the Elder, IV., 168.
- John, Epistles of: the First, IV., 341; the Second, IV., 363; the Third, IV., 364.
- Jonah, sign of, I., 152.
- Joseph, I., 5, 7, 28.
- Joseph, disciple, IV., 17; of Arimathea, IV., 328.
- Judas the Gaulonite, IV., 28.
- Judas Iscariot, I., 94, 295; fate of, I., 306; IV., 16, 17; in Fourth Gospel, IV., 288.
- Jude, Epistle of, III., 313; relation to 2 Peter, III., 327, 344.
- Judgment, in Pauline writings, II., 268; in Fourth Gospel, IV., 281.
- Kingdom of God, as future, II., 128.
- Lake of fire, IV., 141, 144.
- Lamb, the apocalyptic, IV., 112, 131, 140; in Fourth Gospel, IV., 189.
- Laodicea, synod of, III., 392.
- Last Supper, I., 297; IV., 284, 287.
- Law, function of Mosaic, in Pauline writings, II., 220, 223, 283, 285, 301, 307; in Hebrews, III., 41; in Pastorals, III., 200.
- Lazarus, in parable, I., 243; in Fourth Gospel, IV., 267, 272.
- Levi, I., 81.
- Life, IV., 180; eternal, III., 231; bread of, IV., 226, 233.
- Locusts as food, I., 50.
- Logos, IV., 177, 179.
- Lord, use of word by Paul, II., 93.
- Luke, I., xxvi. (paging of introduction in Vol. I.); I., 20.
- Luther on canonical books, III., 393.
- Magi, I., 11, 12, 14.
- Manuscripts, chief New Testament, I., 339.
- Marcion, New Testament of, III., 376.
- Mark, I., xxiii. (as above); spurious ending of, I., 324.
- Mary, mother of Jesus, I., 3, 5, 6, 9, 28 (see also Virgin-birth); at cross, IV., 325.
- Matthew, I., xx., xxi. (as above).
- Melchisedek, III., 38.
- Melito of Sardis, III., 381.
- Menander quoted, II., 125.
- Michael, III., 349.
- Millennium, IV., 142.
- Miracles, I., 368; II., 182; IV., 11. (See also Jesus.)

- Muratorian Canon, III., 382;  
 IV., 164.  
 Mystery, II., 68, 339.  
 Myth, I., 39, 40.  
 Nazareth, name, I., 19; Jesus  
 at, I., 176.  
 Nazarite vow of Paul, IV., 71.  
 Nero, as man of sin, II., 10; as  
 beast, IV., 128, 129, 130, 137;  
 expectation of return, IV.,  
 130.  
 New covenant, III., 46.  
 New Testament, as literature,  
 I., xix; canon of, III., 356-  
 396; printed editions of, I.,  
 346; manuscripts of, I., 336,  
 349; versions of, I., 340.  
 Nicodemus, IV., 199, 205, 328.  
 Oaths, I., 108.  
 Old Testament quotations, I.,  
 352.  
 Onesimus, III., 183, 186.  
 Origen on the canon, III., 391.  
 Papias as witness, I., xxi, xxiv;  
 III., 366; IV., 166.  
 Parables, I., 157, 164, 365-366.  
 Paraclete, IV., 293, 300, 345.  
 Paradise, I., 312.  
 Parousia, I., 273; signs of, in  
 Synoptics, I., 280, 282, 287,  
 290; in Pauline thought, II.,  
 6, 7, 8, 20, 23, 27, 28, 36, 83,  
 123, 128, 345; in Hebrews,  
 III., 52, 55, 59, 61, 62; in  
 various N. T. writings, III.,  
 174, 217, 243, 258, 265, 293,  
 317, 318, 320, 321; why de-  
 layed, III., 339; IV., 19, 23,  
 52; in Revelations, IV., 140,  
 149; in Johannine writings,  
 IV., 292, 302, 348, 350.  
 Pastoral Epistles, III., 189;  
 false teachers in, III., 193;  
 non-Pauline, III., 196, 263.  
 Patmos, IV., 101.  
 Paul, conversion of, II., 251;  
 IV., 36, 37; in Arabia, II., 205;  
 at Jerusalem council, II., 206;  
 IV., 50-55; missionary jour-  
 neys, IV., 45-76; at Antioch,  
 II., 209; arrest, IV., 72; de-  
 fences at Jerusalem, IV., 74;  
 and Cæsarea, IV., 76-79;  
 voyage to Rome, IV., 80-83;  
 at Rome, IV., 84; his psy-  
 chology, II., 30; his Nazarite  
 vow, IV., 71; lost letters, II.,  
 44, 50; Rabbinism of, II., 99;  
 thorn in flesh, II., 181; his  
 visions, II., 179; cites Men-  
 ander, II., 125; his doc-  
 trines: of faith, II., 222, 275,  
 281, 291, 329; of death of  
 Christ, II., 298; of judgment,  
 II., 268; of righteousness, II.,  
 264, 275, 329; of spirit, II., 69;  
 of second coming, see Pa-  
 rousia; his views of marriage,  
 II., 25, 26, 87, 91; his eschat-  
 ology, see Universalism.  
 Penny, value of, I., 244.  
 Pentecost, IV., 17.  
 Peter, I., 67, 69; confesses Jesus  
 Messiah, I., 214; as rock, I.,  
 215; as chief apostle, I., 217;  
 denial, I., 298, 305; IV., 315;  
 at council, II., 205; IV., 50;  
 at Antioch, II., 209; future  
 for, IV., 337; Gospel of, III.,  
 364.  
 Peter, First Epistle of, III., 297;  
 Second, III., 325; relation to  
 First, III., 326; relation to  
 Jude, III., 327.  
 Pfeleiderer, on Luke xxii., 35,  
 I., 299; on glossolaly, IV., 18.  
 Philemon, Epistle to, III., 183.  
 Philip, son of Herod, I., 11, 46,  
 356.  
 Philip the evangelist, IV., 33.  
 Philippians, Epistle to, II., 355-  
 361.  
 Philo, I., 122; in Johannine  
 thought, IV., 161.  
 Pleroma, III., 98.  
 Prætorian guard, II., 366.  
 Prayer, I., 113, 130; Lord's, I.,  
 114.  
 Presbytery, III., 221.

- Prodigal Son, I., 257.  
 Prophet, I., 33.  
 Propitiation, II., 279; IV., 345.  
 Psychology, Pauline, II., 30; III., 112.  
 Publicans, I., 53.  
 Quirinius, I., 34.  
 Rabbinism in Paul, II., 99, 231.  
 Ramsay on credibility of Acts, IV., 9, 28.  
 Redemption, in Pauline writings, II., 277, 289; in Hebrews, III., 48; in Colossians, III., 94; in Ephesians, III., 135; in First Peter, III., 307.  
 Resurrection of Jesus, I., 216, 320, 326-331; III., 144; IV., 223; Jesus' doctrine of, I., 263; in Pauline writings, II., 119, 126, 150; in Hebrews, III., 77.  
 Revelation, introduction, IV., 87; contents, IV., 89; literary structure, IV., 91; author, IV., 94; time of, IV., 97.  
 Righteousness in Pauline writings, II., 264, 275.  
 Romans, Epistle to, II., 243; analysis, II., 247.  
 Rome, origin of church at, II., 245; as harlot, IV., 136; overthrow of, IV., 138 (see Beast).  
 Sabbath, Jesus and the, I., 85-89.  
 Sadducees, I., 356.  
 Saints, II., 256; to judge the world, II., 83; and angels, II., 85.  
 Salome, I., 193, 356.  
 Samaritan, parable of the Good, I., 265.  
 Samaritan woman, the, IV., 208, 214.  
 Sanctification, II., 85.  
 Satan, I., 63; II., 23, 81; synagogue of, IV., 109; as dragon, IV., 127.  
 Saul, see Paul.  
 Schmiedel, on Acts, IV., 7, 9; on Cornelius, IV., 41.  
 Seals, seven, IV., 110; sealing of saints, IV., 114.  
 Seneca, I., 110.  
 Serapion and Gospel of Peter, III., 388.  
 Sermon on the Mount, I., 95-138.  
 Shekel, I., 223.  
 Signs, seven, of Fourth Gospel, IV., 152.  
 Simeon, I., 41.  
 Simon, see Peter; of Cyrene, I., 310; IV., 323.  
 Sin, in Pauline writings, II., 156, 294; man of, II., 10; the unpardonable, IV., 360; the unrepentable, III., 35.  
 Slavery, II., 90; III., 119, 172.  
 Son, of God, I., 28, 29; IV., 184, 187; of Man, I., 360-363; only-begotten, IV., 184. (See also Christology.)  
 Spirit of God, II., 310.  
 Spirits in prison, III., 314, 316.  
 Star in the east, I., 14.  
 Stephen the deacon, IV., 29; his address, IV., 30; death, IV., 32.  
 Storm, stilling the, I., 169.  
 Swine and demoniacs, I., 170.  
 Synoptic problem, I., xxviii.  
 Talmud, I., 363.  
 Tares, I., 160.  
 Tartarus, III., 334.  
 Tatian, I., 3; III., 378.  
 Temple, the heavenly, IV., 123.  
 Tertullian, III., 385.  
 Textual criticism, I., 332-335.  
 Theodore, of Mopsuestia, III., 392.  
 Theophilus, I., 22; III., 381.  
 Thessalonians, First Epistle to, II., 1-5; analysis of, II., 15; Second, II., 6-13; analysis of, II., 33.  
 Thessalonica, IV., 59.  
 Theudas, IV., 28.  
 Tiberius, I., 45.

- Timothy, III., 190; IV., 56;  
     First Epistle to, III., 190;  
     Second, III., 192.  
 Titus, Epistle to, III., 192.  
 Tongues, speaking in, II., 113;  
     IV., 18.  
 Transfiguration of Jesus, I.,  
     219.  
 Tree of life, IV., 105, 148.  
 Trinity, II., 76, 93.  
 Triple tradition, I., xxxi.  
 Trumpets, the seven, IV., 117.  
  
 Unbelief of Israel discussed, II.,  
     316-340.  
 Unity of God, II., 76 285; III.,  
     207; Origen on, II., 92.  
 Universalism, of Paul, II., 122,  
     124, 154, 340; in Ephesians,  
     III., 137.  
 Universe, Pauline, II., 377.  
  
 Valentinus, witness for canon,  
     III., 375.  
 Various readings of N. T. text,  
     I., 332.  
 Versions of New Testament, I.,  
     340.  
 Vespasian heals blind man, I.,  
     213.  
 Virgin-birth of Jesus, see Jesus.  
  
 Virgins, the ten, I., 285.  
 Vision hypothesis of resur-  
     rection of Jesus, I., 330.  
 Visions, Pauline, II., 179; at  
     conversion of Paul, IV., 37, 39.  
  
 War in heaven, IV., 124.  
 Weitzsäcker, on 2 Thessalonians,  
     II., 8; on disputes of Jesus  
     with Jews, IV., 158.  
 Wendt on Fourth Gospel, IV.,  
     165.  
 Widows, III., 222-226.  
 Widow's mite, I., 272.  
 Witnesses, the two, IV., 121;  
     the heavenly, IV., 359.  
 Woman, the Syro-Phœnician,  
     I., 208; taken in adultery,  
     IV., 248; the apocalyptic, IV.,  
     123; in church, II., 104, 118;  
     III., 209.  
 Word (see Logos); of God, II.,  
     22; III., 27.  
 World, end of, I., 165.  
 Wrath of God, II., 265, 292.  
  
 Zaccheus, I., 248.  
 Zacharias, I., 23, 31.  
 Zahn on Synoptics, I., xxix.  
 Zealots, I., 94.  
 Zeus, I., 119.



*A Selection from the  
Catalogue of*  
**G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS**



**Complete Catalogues sent  
on application**



# AMERICAN LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS

---

- I. **Rhys-Davids—Buddhism: Its History and Literature.** By T. W. RHYS-DAVIDS, LL.D., Ph.D., Professor of Pali and Buddhist Literature at University College, London. Crown octavo. \$1.50.

" . . . An admirable handbook of Buddhism, written from a point of view at once scholarly and unprejudiced."—*St. Paul Pioneer Press*.

- II. **Brinton—Religions of Primitive Peoples.** By DANIEL G. BRINTON, A.M., M.D., LL.D., Sc.D., Professor of Archæology and Linguistics in the University of Pennsylvania. Crown octavo. \$1.50.

" . . . No book has yet appeared which brings the religious thought of all races and times within closer range of the modern reader; and to the reader who revels in tracing the psychic history of man, no book can be more welcome."—*Boston Transcript*.

- III. **Cheyne—Jewish Religious Life after the Exile.** By Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., D.D., Oriel Professor of Interpretation of Holy Scripture in the University of Oxford, and formerly Fellow of Balliol College; Canon of Rochester. Crown octavo. \$1.50.

"Few men are as well qualified as Canon Cheyne to discuss the Jewish literature and life of the period covered by this course, and the treatment of the subject before us in this handsome volume is all that could be desired. . . . The whole book is exceedingly interesting and instructive."—*Universalist Leader*.

- IV. **Budde—Religion of Israel to the Exile.** By KARL BUDDE, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Strassburg. Crown octavo. \$1.50.

"The chief merit of Professor Budde's book is its condensation. He gives a distinct view of the subject, undistracted by details. While the book will take its deserved place in the estimation of scholars it is also a book for the general reader."—*The Outlook*.

- V. **Steindorff—The Religion of the Ancient Egyptians.** By G. STEINDORFF, Ph.D., Professor of Egyptology at the University of Leipzig. Crown octavo. *Net*, \$1.50.

"Presents in compact form and interesting style the latest information, and should find a place in every library of comparative religions."—*The Congregationalist*.

By **W. M. RAMSAY.**

---

**The Church in the Roman Empire Before A.D. 170**

With Maps and Illustrations, Octavo

\$3.00

"It is a book of very exceptional value. Prof. Ramsay is a real scholar and of the very best type of scholarship. A thoroughly good book; a product of first-hand and accurate scholarship; in the highest degree suggestive; and not only valuable in its results, but an admirable example of the true method of research."  
—*The Churchman*.

**St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen**

With Map, Octavo

\$3.00

"Professor Ramsay has made a solid and valuable contribution to the interpretation of the Apostolic literature and of the Apostolic age—a contribution distinguished no less by ripe scholarship, independent judgment, keen vision, and easy mastery of material, than by freshness of thought, boldness of combination, and striking originality of view."—*The Speaker*.

**Impressions of Turkey During Twelve  
Years' Wanderings**

Octavo

\$1.75

"No conception of the real status of Turkey is possible unless something is understood of 'the interlacing and alternation of the separate and unblending races.' Such an understanding is admirably presented in Prof. Ramsay's book, which gives a near and trustworthy insight into actual Turkish conditions."  
—*N. Y. Times*.

**Was Christ Born at Bethlehem ?**

A Study in the Credibility of St. Luke. Part I. The Importance of the Problem. Part II. The Solution of the Problem.

Octavo

\$1.75

"The work is one of which students of biblical criticism will need to take account. It is absolutely candid and straightforward, thorough and discriminating, and courteous to other scholars whose conclusions it sees most reason to condemn. It is a fine piece of work."—*The Congregationalist*.

**Historical Commentary Upon the Epistle  
to the Galatians**

Octavo

net, \$3.00

"This work is worthy of a place in any biblical scholar's library as very helpful to a clear understanding of what St. Paul's message is to the Galatians, and through them to the Christian Church in subsequent time."—*London Athenæum*.

**The Education of Christ**

16°

\$1.00

"Here is a book which warms the heart and enlightens the mind. It is written by a man of the largest knowledge, of the ripest scholarship, of a truly devout and Christian spirit. It is instructive, edifying, strengthening, inspiring."  
—*Church Standard*.

---

New York **G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS** London

# International Handbooks to the New Testament

Edited by Orello Cone, D.D.

Four volumes. Octavo. Each, net, \$2.00

By mail, \$2.15

- I.—**The Synoptic Gospels, together with a Chapter on the Text-Criticism of the New Testament.** By George Lovell Cary, A.M., L.H.D., President of the Meadville Theological School.

"We need hardly say that we find ourselves differing very seriously and very often from the editor of this volume, but we gladly recognize the thoughtfulness and intelligence with which he has worked. The student may learn much from this volume."—*N. Y. Observer*.

- II.—**The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians, Thessalonians, Galatians, Romans, and Philippians.** By James Drummond, M.A., LL.D., Litt.D., Principal of Manchester College, Oxford.

"If the promise given by this volume is fulfilled, the series will prove of the highest value. It is attractive for the general reader, while it is of special value to advanced students."—*The Outlook*.

- III.—**The Epistles to the Hebrews, Colossians, Ephesians, and Philemon, The Pastoral Epistles, The Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude, together with a Sketch of the History of the Canon of the New Testament.** By Orello Cone, D.D., Professor of Biblical Theology in the Canton Theological School.

"It is interesting to note the meaning often hitherto unexplained. The author succeeds because his explanations are reasonable and plausible. He is not bound to any rule of dogma or sect, but takes a broad and understanding view of his subject."—*Church Review*.

- IV.—**The Acts of the Apostles, Revelation, The Gospel of John, The Three Epistles of John.** By Henry P. Forbes, D.D., Dean of the School of Theology of St. Lawrence University and Craig Professor of Biblical Language and Literature.

Send for complete descriptive circular

New York — G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS — London

